



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 3] नई दिल्ली, जनवरी 10-जनवरी 16, 2010, शनिवार/पौष 20-पौष 26, 1931
No. 3] NEW DELHI, JANUARY 10-JANUARY 16, 2010, SATURDAY/PAUSA 20-PAUSA 26, 1931

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 144.—सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभागियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा-3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के कालम (2) में वर्णित अधिकारियों को भारत सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के पद के समकक्ष होने के नाते कथित अधिनियम के उद्देश्यों हेतु सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है जो कथित सारणी के कालम (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर कथित अधिनियम के अंतर्गत अथवा उसके द्वारा सम्पदा अधिकारी को भौंपे गए कर्तव्यों का निर्वहन और प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे :

सारणी

क्रम सं.	अधिकारी का पदनाम	सरकारी परिसरों की श्रेणियां तथा क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाएं
1	2	3
1.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, जालंधर (पंजाब)	पंजाब राज्य में जालंधर में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
2.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, मुजफ्फरपुर (बिहार)	बिहार राज्य में मुजफ्फरपुर में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
3.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, पुणे (महाराष्ट्र)	महाराष्ट्र राज्य में पुणे में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां

1	2	3
4.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, लखनऊ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में लखनऊ में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
5.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में इलाहाबाद में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
6.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, (संभरण एवं लेखा) मध्य सेक्टर केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, लखनऊ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में लखनऊ में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
7.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, भोपाल (मध्य प्रदेश)	मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में भोपाल में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
8.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, ग्वालियर, (मध्य प्रदेश)	मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में ग्वालियर में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
9.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, ग्रेटर नोएडा (उत्तर प्रदेश)	उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में ग्रेटर नोएडा में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
10.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, बिलासपुर, (छत्तीसगढ़)	छत्तीस गढ़ राज्य में बिलासपुर में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
11.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक, ग्रुप केन्द्र, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, सिलचर, (आसाम)	आसाम राज्य में सिलचर जिला-कछार में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां
12.	पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक/प्रिंसिपल, प्रतिविद्रोहिता एवं आतंक विरोधी स्कूल, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल, सिलचर, (आसाम)	आसाम राज्य में सिलचर, जिला-कछार में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल से संबंधित भूमि परिसर व परिसंपत्तियां

[फा. सं. ए-11-18/08-09-प्रशा-1 (श्रीनगर)-एमएचए-पीएफ-III]

एच. के. सुआनथंग, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 18th November, 2009

S.O. 144.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Un-authorized Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the Officers mentioned in column (2) of the Table below, being the officers equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officers of the Government, to be Estate Officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the Estate Officer by or under the said Act within the local limits of the jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (3) of the said Table :

TABLE

S. No.	Designation of the Officer	Public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Jalandhar (Punjab)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Jalandhar in the State of Punjab.
2.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Muzaffarpur, (Bihar)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Muzaffarpur in the State of Bihar.
3.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Pune (Maharashtra)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Pune in the State of Maharashtra
4.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Lucknow in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

1	2	3
5.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Allahabad (Uttar Pradesh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Allahabad in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
6.	Deputy Inspector General (Provision & Accounts) Central Sector, Central Reserve Police Force, Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Lucknow in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
7.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Bhopal in the State of Madhya Pradesh.
8.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Gwalior in the State of Madhya Pradesh.
9.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Greater Noida (Uttar Pradesh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Greater Noida in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
10.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Bilaspur (Chhattishgarh)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Bilaspur in the State of Chhattishgarh.
11.	Deputy Inspector General of Police Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Silchar (Assam)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Silchar in the State of Assam.
12.	Deputy Inspector General Principal, Counter Insurgency and Anti Terrorist School, Central Reserve Police Force, Silchar (Assam)	Premises of land and assets belonging to the Central Reserve Police Force at Silchar in the State of Assam.

[File No. A-II-18/08-09-Adm-IMHA-PF.-III]

H. KAM SUANTHANG Under Secy.

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 145.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए बिहार राज्य सरकार, गृह (पुलिस) विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या-1/सी.बी.आई. 80-03/09-एच. (पी.)/3938/पटना दिनांक 25-6-09 द्वारा सहमति से पुलिस थाना कदमकुआँ, (जिला पटना) में भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 302/120बी/34 और आयुध अधिनियम की धारा-27 के अन्तर्गत श्री संतोष टेकरीवाल की हत्या से संबंधित अपराध संख्या-0166/2009 दिनांक 12-06-2009 सहित उक्त मामले से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्न, दुष्प्रेरण और षडयंत्र तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किये गये अथवा उन्ही तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध का अन्वेषण करने के लिये दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण बिहार राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/31/2009-ए.वी.डी.-II]

चंद्र प्रकाश, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC
GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS**

(Department of Personnel and Training)

New Delhi, the 8th January, 2010

S.O. 145.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Bihar, Home (Police) Department, vide Notification No. 1/C.B.I. 80/03/09 H(P)/3938 dated 25th June, 2009, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Bihar for investigation of the Case No. 166/09 dated 12-6-2009 under sections 302, 120-B, and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Act No. 54 of 1959) registered at Police Station Kadamkuan (District Patna) relating to the murder of Sh. Santosh Tekriwal and attempt, abetment and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with the above mentioned offences and any other offence/offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/31/2009-AVD-II]

CHANDRA PRAKASH Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 146.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा राज्य सरकार, गृह विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 20/1/2010-3-एचजी-1 दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 2010 द्वारा सहमति से पुलिस स्टेशन, सैक्टर-5, पंचकूला में भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 166, 167, 191, 195, 201, 340, 344, 347, 348, 357, 358, 467, 471, 506, 120-बी के अधीन दर्ज एफआईआर सं. 573 दिनांक 29-12-2009 और पुलिस स्टेशन सैक्टर-5, पंचकूला में भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 166, 167, 182, 191, 195-ए, 201, 307, 340, 344, 347, 348, 357, 358, 467, 471, 506, और 120-बी के अधीन दर्ज एफआईआर सं. 574 दिनांक 29-12-2009 और पुलिस स्टेशन सैक्टर-5, पंचकूला में भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 306, 107, 108, 120-बी के अधीन दर्ज एफआईआर सं. 7 दिनांक 5-1-2010 के मामले के संबंध में और उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और षडयंत्रों और अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों का अन्वेषण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण हरियाणा राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/2/2010-ए.वी.डी.-II]

चंद्र प्रकाश, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th January, 2010

S.O. 146.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Haryana. Home Department, vide Notification No. 20/1/2010-3HG-I dated 7th January, 2010, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Haryana for investigation of FIR No. 573 dated 29-12-2009 under sections 166, 167, 191, 195, 201, 340, 344, 347, 348, 357, 358, 467, 471, 506 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) registered at Police Station, Sector-5, Panchkula, FIR No. 574 dated 29-12-2009 under sections 166, 167, 182, 191, 195-A, 201, 307, 340, 344, 347, 348, 357, 358, 467, 471, 506 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) registered at Police Station, Sector-5, Panchkula, FIR No. 7 dated

5-1-2010 under section 306, 107, 108 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) registered at Police Station, Sector-5, Panchkula and attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the above mentioned offences and any other offence/offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/2/2010-AVD-II]

CHANDRA PRAKASH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 147.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित अपराधों का दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के द्वारा अन्वेषण किए जाने के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है :-

- (क) भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 195, 195 ए, 348, 357 और 358 के तहत दंडनीय अपराधों और
- (ख) उक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और षडयंत्रों और उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत कोई अन्य अपराध

[संख्या 228/2/2010-ए.वी.डी.-II]

चंद्र प्रकाश, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th January, 2010

S.O. 147.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government hereby specifies the following offences which are to be investigated by the Delhi Special Police Establishment namely :—

- (a) Offence punishable under sections 195, 195-A, 348, 357 and 358 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and
- (b) Attempt, abetment and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with the Offences mentioned above and any other offence or offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/2/2010-AVD-II]

CHANDRA PRAKASH, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

सीमा शुल्क के आयुक्त का कार्यालय

पुणे, 16 नवम्बर, 2009

संख्या 01/2009-नॉन टैरिफ-सीमा शुल्क

का.आ. 148.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 8 तथा दिनांक 26 अप्रैल, 2005 की अधिसूचना संख्या 04/2005-एन टी-सीमा शुल्क, दिनांक 2 जनवरी, 2006 की अधिसूचना संख्या 01/2006-एन टी-सीमा शुल्क तथा दिनांक 8 मार्च, 2007 की

अधिसूचना संख्या 01/2007-एन टी-सीमा शुल्क के अधीन प्रदत्त अधिकारों को कार्यान्वित करते हुए, मैं, श्री आर. सेकर, आयुक्त सीमा शुल्क, पुणे, एतद्वारा इस अधिसूचना की अनुसूची के स्तंभ 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट, स्तंभ 2 में उल्लिखित पत्तन (पोर्ट), स्तंभ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट स्थान को कोयला उतारने के लिए सीमा शुल्क क्षेत्र के रूप में मंजूरी प्रदान करता हूँ।

उपर्युक्त घोषणाएं, सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम 1962 के संबंधित उपबंधों का कड़ाई से पालन तथा भारत सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर जारी अनुदेशों का अनुसरण किए जाने की शर्तों पर की जा रही है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	पत्तन का नाम	अवतरण/लैंडिंग स्थान	सीमा शुल्क क्षेत्र की सीमा
1	2	3	4
1.	रानपार पत्तन (पोर्ट)	मैसर्ज फिनोलेक्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड की दो निजी जेट्टी	100 मीटर्स की कन्साइनमेंट जेट्टी के मुख्य तथा अतिरिक्त डायमेशन्स। दो जेट्टी की सभी चारों दिशाओं तथा दो जेट्टी के बीच की 600 मीटर्स की दूरी।

[फा. सं. VIII/सी. शु./48-149/टी सी/09/4136]

आर. सेकर, आयुक्त

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE CUSTOMS

Pune, the 16th November, 2009

No. 01/2009-NT-CUSTOMS

S.O. 148.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Section 8 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) and in continuation of notification No. 4/2005-NT-Customs dt. 26th April, 2005, notification No. 1/2006-NT-Customs dt. 2nd January, 2006 and notification No. 1/2007-NT-Customs dt. 8th March, 2007, I, Shri R. Sekar, Commissioner of Customs, Pune hereby approve the place specified in col. 3 of the schedule to this notification, located in the port mentioned at col. 2 of the said schedule to be the Customs Area for unloading of coal as specified in col. 4 of the said schedule.

The above declarations are subject to strict observance of relevant provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and the instructions issued by Government of India from time to time in pursuance thereof.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Name of Port	Landing Place	Customs Area Limits
1	2	3	4
1	Ranpar Port	Two Private Jetties of M/s. Finolex Industries Ltd.	Main & over Dimension Consignment Jetty with 100 mtrs. On all 4 sides of the two jetties and the distance of 600 mtrs. between the two jetties.

[F. No. VIII/Cus/48-149/TC/09/4136]

R. SEKAR, Commissioner

कार्यालय, मुख्य आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

अहमदाबाद, 21 दिसम्बर, 2009

सं. 02/2009-2010 सीमा शुल्क (गै. टै.)

का.आ. 149.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 152 के खण्ड (क) के अंतर्गत जारी भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, नई दिल्ली की अधिसूचना सं. 33/94 सी. शु. (गै. टै.) दिनांक 1 जुलाई, 1994 के साथ पठित यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना सं. 14/2002 सी. शु. (गै. टै.) दिनांक 7 मार्च, 2002 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं, अजीत कुमार, मुख्य आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद क्षेत्र, एतद्वारा “सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 9 के अंतर्गत गुजरात राज्य के गाँव पड़ाना, तहसील-

गांधीधाम, जिला कच्छ, को भाण्डागारण स्टेशन” के रूप में घोषित करता हूँ।

[फा. सं. V/30-115/मु.आ.का/तक./2009]

अजीत कुमार, मुख्य आयुक्त

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE

Ahmedabad, the 21st December, 2009

No. 02/2009-2010 Customs (N.T.)

S.O. 149.—In exercise of the powers conferred vide Notification No. 33/94 Cus (NT) dated 1st of July 1994 of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department

of Revenue, New Delhi, issued under Clause (a) of Section 152 of the Customs Act, 1962, read with Notification No. 14/2002-Cus. (NT) dated 7th March 2002, as amended, I Ajit Kumar, Chief Commissioner of Central Excise, Ahmedabad Zone, hereby declare Village Padana, of Tehsil-Gandhidham, District Kutch in the State of Gujarat, to be a Warehousing Station under Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962.

[F. No. V/30-115/CCO/Tech/2009]

AJIT KUMER, Chief Commissioner

सूचना एवं प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 21 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 150.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 10-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के हैदराबाद सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :-

1. श्रीमती वाई. सुनीता चौधरी
2. श्री एम. मनमोहन रेड्डी
3. श्रीमती स्वपना
4. श्रीमती रीति
5. श्री कोमिरेड्डी कृष्ण विजय आजाद
6. श्रीमती के. निवेदिता गोवर्धन रेड्डी
7. श्रीमती डी. विजय लक्ष्मी

[फा. सं. 809/3/2009-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 21st December, 2009

S.O. 150.—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematography (Certification) Rules, 1983 the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Hyderabad Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :—

1. Smt. Y. Sunitha Chowdary
2. Shri M. Manmohan Reddy
3. Smt. Swapna
4. Smt. Reethi
5. Shri Komireddy Krishna Vijay Azad
6. Smt. K. Nivedita Goverdhan Reddy
7. Smt. D. Vijaya Lakshmi

[F. No. 809/3/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 151.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 10-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुंबई सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :-

1. श्री योगेश दुबे
2. श्री अली असगर सिद्दीकी
3. डॉ मृणालिनी ए. दयाल
4. डॉ इरशाद कॉमिल
5. श्रीमति उषा मुरलीधर फेले
6. श्री यशराज

[फा. सं. 809/7/2009-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2009

S.O. 151.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Mumbai Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :—

1. Dr. Yogesh Dube
2. Shri Ali Asgar Sadequian
3. Dr. Mrunalini A. Dayal
4. Dr. Irshad Kamil

5. Smt. Usha Murlidhar Phale

6. Shri Jesuraj

[F.No. 809/7/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 152.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 10-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुंबई सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :—

(1) श्री अशोक काम्बले, फ्लैट नं. 12, दूसरा तल, राम प्रसाद सोसायटी, अंबानी अस्पताल के सामने, पोर बंगलो, अंधेरी (प.), मुम्बई-400 053

(2) डॉ. राजकुमार वेरका, 62, 63, 64, नेहरू शॉपिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स, लारेन्स रोड, अमृतसर, पंजाब।

[फा. सं. 809/7/2009-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th December, 2009

S.O. 152.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Mumbai Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

(1) Shri Ashok Kamble, Flat No. 12, 2nd Floor, Ram Prosad Society, Opp. Ambani Hospital, Por Banglo, Andheri (W), Mumbai-400 053.

(2) Dr. Raj Kumar Verka, 62, 63, 64, Nehru Shopping Complex, Lawrence Road, Amritsar, Punjab.

[F.No. 809/7/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 21 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 153.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 10-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल

प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के दिल्ली सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :—

1. श्रीमती प्रिया सिंह

2. श्री सागरमल बैद

3. श्री अनिल कुमार कुक्रेजा

4. श्री राजेश गुप्ता

[फा. सं. 809/8/2009-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 21st December, 2009

S.O. 153.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Delhi Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :—

1. Mrs. Priya Singh

2. Shri Sagarmal Baid

3. Shri Anil Kumar Kukreja

4. Shri Rajesh Gupta

[F.No. 809/8/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 30 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 154.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 10-11-2009 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार श्री रोख शाहजहाँ, द्वारा एस. के. वाली, प्लॉट नं. 105, मुरुति ईस्टेट, निजामपेट रोड, कुक्कटपल्ली, हैदराबाद-500072 को तत्काल प्रभाव से 2 वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के हैदराबाद सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/3/2009-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 30th December, 2009

S.O. 154.—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in

exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri Shaik Shajahan, C/o S. K. Vali, Plot No. 105, Muruthi Estate, Nizampet Road, Kukatpally, Hyderabad-500072 as a member of the Hyderabad Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 809/3/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 31 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 155.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 11-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के कोलकाता सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :-

1. श्री ममता शंकर
2. सुश्री रत्न लोड
3. सुश्री कविता रहमान
4. सुश्री सुपर्णा बनर्जी
5. सुश्री अनामिता सेन
6. सुश्री सुस्मिता घोष
7. श्री एन. के. सिंह

[फा. सं. 809/3/2008-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 31st December, 2009

S.O. 155.—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 11-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematography (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Kolkata Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

1. Ms. Mamata Shankar
2. Ms. Ratna Lodh
3. Ms. Kabita Rahman

4. Ms. Suparna Banerjee

5. Ms. Anamita Sen

6. Ms. Susmita Ghosh

7. Shri N. K. Singh

[F. No. 809/3/2008-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 21 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 156.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 11-11-2009 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार श्री केशव चंद्र राउत को तत्काल प्रभाव से 2 वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के कटक सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/4/2008-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 21st December, 2009

S.O. 156.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 11-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri Keshab Chandra Rout as a member of the Cuttack Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 809/4/2008-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 21 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 157.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 10-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के बेंगलूर सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :-

1. श्रीमती उमा पाटील
2. श्री एस. के. आर. जिलानी पाशा
3. श्री के. प्रसन्ना कुमार
4. श्री पी.एस. निरंजन राव

5. श्रीमती संध्या एस. कुमार
6. श्री प्रदीप कुसनुर
7. श्री प्रसाद अबय्या
8. श्री शामनूर शिवशंकरप्पा गणेश
9. श्री रवि राठौर
10. श्रीमती कमलम्मा
11. श्रीमती वसंती शिवन्ना
12. श्री आर. के. राजु
13. श्री आर. नारायणास्वामी
14. श्री चिन्ने गोवदा

[फा. सं. 809/5/2009-एफ(सी)]
अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 21st December, 2009

S.O. 157.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematography (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Bangalore Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

1. Smt. Uma Patil
2. Shri S.K.R. Jilani Pasha
3. Shri K. Prasanna Kumar
4. Shri P.S. Niranjana Rao
5. Smt. Sandhya S. Kumar
6. Shri Pradeep Kusnur
7. Shri Prasad Abbayya
8. Shri Shamanur Shivashankarappa Ganesh
9. Shri Ravi Rathod
10. Smt. Kamalamma
11. Smt. Vasanthi Shivanna
12. Shri R.K. Raju
13. Shri R. Narayanaswamy
14. Shri Chinne Gowda

[F. No. 809/5/2009-F(C)]
AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 21 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 158.—इस मंत्रालय के दिनांक 10-11-2009 के समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम 1983 के नियम 7 एवं 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के तिरुवनंतपुरम मलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :-

1. श्रीमती थैंकमणि दिवाकरण
2. डॉ. (सुश्री) जौली जचारिया
3. श्री पी.एस. बाबुराज
4. श्री बी. बैजू
5. डॉ. (श्रीमती) लक्ष्मी पी. नायर
6. श्री के.पी. शशिधरन उन्निदन
7. श्रीमती नुजरत जहां ई.के.
8. डॉ. वी.ए. अगस्तिन
9. श्री ए.एम.दिलीप कुमार
10. श्री यू.के.कुमारन
11. श्री आर. के. रवि वर्मा
12. श्री ए. संजीवन

[फा. सं. 809/6/2009-एफ(सी)]
अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 21st December, 2009

S.O. 158.—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematography (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Thiruvananthapuram Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

1. Mrs. Thankamony Divakaran
2. Dr (Ms) Jolly Zacharia
3. Shri P.S. Baburaj
4. Shri B. Baiju
5. Dr (Mrs) Lekshmi P. Nair
6. Shri K.P. Sasidharan Unnithan

7. Smt. Nuzarath Jahan E.K.
8. Dr. V.A. Augustine
9. Shri A.M. Dileep Kumar
10. Shri U.K. Kumaran
11. Shri R.K. Ravi Varma
12. Shri A. Sajeevan

[F. No. 809/6/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 159.—केंद्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, दूरदर्शन महानिदेशालय (सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय) के निम्नलिखित अधीनस्थ केंद्रों/कार्यालयों, जिनके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है :

1. दूरदर्शन अनुरक्षण केंद्र, बड़ौदा ।
2. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, गोधरा ।
3. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, लूणावाड़ा ।
4. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, छोटा उदयपुर ।
5. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, दाहोद ।
6. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, देवगढ़ वारिया ।
7. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, संजनी ।
8. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, खंभात ।
9. दूरदर्शन उच्च शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, कटक ।
10. दूरदर्शन उच्च शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, गुना (मध्य प्रदेश) ।
11. दूरदर्शन अनुरक्षण केंद्र, सूरत ।
12. दूरदर्शन उच्च शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, सूरत ।
13. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, आहवा ।
14. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, नवापुरा ।
15. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, दमण ।
16. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, धरमपुर ।
17. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, सोनगढ़ ।
18. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, बलसाड़ ।
19. दूरदर्शन अल्प शक्ति ट्रांसमीटर, बरहामपुर (उड़ीसा) ।

[सं. ई-11017/6/2010-हिंदी]

प्रियम्बदा, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 159.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under Directorate General of Doordarshan (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting),

more than 80% of the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

1. Doordarshan Maintenance Centre, Baroda
2. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Godhra
3. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Lunavada
4. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Chhota Udaipur
5. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Dahod
6. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Devgarh Baria
7. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Sanjani
8. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Khambhat
9. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Cuttack
10. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Guna (Madhya Pradesh)
11. Doordarshan Maintenance Centre, Surat
12. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Surat
13. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Ahwa
14. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Nawapur
15. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Daman
16. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Dharampur
17. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Songarh
18. Doordarshan Low Power Transmitter, Valsad
19. Doordarshan High Power Transmitter, Berhampur (Orissa)

[No. F-11017/6/2010-Hindi]

PRIYAMVADA, Director (O.L.)

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 160.—केंद्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, आकाशवाणी महानिदेशालय (सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय) के निम्नलिखित अधीनस्थ केंद्रों/कार्यालय, जिनके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है :

1. आकाशवाणी, पटियाला ।

[सं. ई-11017/6/2010-हिंदी]

प्रियम्बदा, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 160.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under Directorate General of All India Radio (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting), more than 80% of the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

1. All India Radio (AIR), Patiala

[No. F-11017/6/2010-Hindi]

PRIYAMVADA, Director (O.L.)

पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 161.—सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 की धारा 5(1)/धारा 19(1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों को उनके नाम के सामने दर्शाए गए विनिर्दिष्ट विषय-वस्तु के संदर्भ में केन्द्रीय जन सूचना अधिकारियों/अपीलीय प्राधिकारियों आदि के रूप में नामोद्दिष्ट किया जाता है :-

1. उपरोक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5(1) के अंतर्गत केन्द्रीय जन सूचना अधिकारियों के रूप में नामोद्दिष्ट निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों को किया जाता है :-

क्रम सं.	पदनाम	दूरभाष सं.	विषय वस्तु
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	श्री एस. पी. यादव, उप वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 23389883 jdntca@gmail.com	राष्ट्रीय बाघ संरक्षण प्राधिकरण (एनटीसीए) से संबंधित मामले
2.	श्री बी. के. सिंह, सहायक वन महानिरीक्षक	bksingh38@hotmail.com विज्ञान सदन, आर.के. पुरम, दूरभाष सं. 26101190	वन संरक्षण (आंध्र प्रदेश, चंडीगढ़, दिल्ली, हरियाणा, कर्नाटक, मध्य प्रदेश, मणिपुर, मेघालय, उड़ीसा, पांडिचेरी और उत्तराखंड)
3.	श्री उमाकान्त, सहायक वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 26101127 umakant1996@yahoo.co.in	वन संरक्षण (अंदमान और निकोबार, असम, सिक्किम, केरल, महाराष्ट्र, नगालैंड, पंजाब, तमिलनाडु, उत्तर प्रदेश, पश्चिम बंगाल, त्रिपुरा)
4.	सुश्री शैली रंजन, सहायक वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 24361223 इंटरकॉम सं. 444 shally.eap@gmail.com	बाह्य सहायता प्राप्त परियोजनाओं (ईएपी)/पूर्वोत्तर राज्य प्रकोष्ठ (एनईसेल) से संबंधित कार्य और वन सुरक्षा प्रभाग (एफपीडी), संयुक्त वन प्रबंधन (जेएफएम) प्रकोष्ठ, जलवायु परिवर्तन संबंधी संयुक्त राष्ट्र फ्रेमवर्क कन्वेंशन (यूएनएफसीसीसी) के अंतर्गत एल्यूएल्यूसीएफ, गैर इमारती लकड़ी के वन उत्पाद।
5.	श्री राजन सहगल, सहायक वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 24362131 इंटरकॉम सं. 109 aig rtdig@yahoo.com	अनुसंधान और प्रशिक्षण (आरटी) वन नीति (एफपी)
6.	श्री सी. डी. सिंह, सहायक वन महानिरीक्षक	Cdsingh1987@rediffmail.com विज्ञान सदन, आर.के. पुरम दूरभाष सं. 26101153	- वन संरक्षण (अरुणाचल प्रदेश, छत्तीसगढ़, दादर और नगर हवेली, दमन और दीव, गोआ, गुजरात, हिमाचल प्रदेश, झारखंड, मिजोरम, राजस्थान) - वन संरक्षण के प्रशासनिक मामले - वन (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1980 - वन सलाहकार समिति
7.	श्री विवेक सक्सेना, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24362065 vivekaxena@gmail.com इंटरकॉम सं. 135	- प्रतिपूर्ति वनीकरण निधि प्रबंध और योजना प्राधिकरण (साएएमपीए) - गोविन्द बल्लभ पंत हिमालय पर्यावरण विकास संस्थान (जीवीपीएच आईईडी) और एकीकृत पर्वत विकास के लिए अन्तरराष्ट्रीय केन्द्र (आईसीआईएमओडी)
8.	श्री आर के सेठी, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24362252 rksethi@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 135	क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल, राष्ट्रीय सीडीएम प्राधिकरण की बैठकों सहित स्वच्छ विकास तंत्र (सीडीएम), उपशमन, प्रौद्योगिकी हस्तान्तरण और ऊर्जा सक्षमता से संबंधित मुद्दे, स्वच्छ विकास और जलवायु पर एशिया-पेसिफिक पार्टनरशिप, वैज्ञानिक और तकनीकी सलाह पर सहायक निकाय (एसबीएसटीए), सीडीएम और संबंधित मुद्दों पर परामर्शदात्री उप-समूह। आरटीआई मामले/मंत्रिमंडल से संबंधित मामले/प्रधान मंत्री कार्यालय के संदर्भ में उनके कार्य से संबंधित संसद प्रश्न और अन्य संसदीय मामले, जलवायु परिवर्तन पर इंटरनेट

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			पॉलिसी सर्च सब्सिडरी बॉडी ऑफ इम्प्लीमेंटेशन, राजनैतिक उप समूह सहित जलवायु परिवर्तन पर परामर्शदात्री समूह, उप-समूह, क्लाइमेट मॉडेलिंग, उप-समूह, यूएनएफसीसीसी के अंतर्गत वित्तपोषण, सीओपी/एमओपी और अन्य, यूएनएफसीसीसी से संबंधित बैठक
9.	श्री ए. ए. राव, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361797 raoancha@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 182	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (ईई) पर्यावरणीय शिक्षा - पर्यावरणीय शिक्षा केन्द्र, अहमदाबाद - सीपीआर पर्यावरणीय शिक्षा केन्द्र, चेन्नई - नये उत्कृष्टता केन्द्र की स्थापना - राष्ट्रीय पर्यावरण जागरूकता अभियान (एनईएपी) और मीडिया सेल - राष्ट्रीय जैव-विविधता प्राधिकरण (एनबीए), जैव विविधता पर कन्वेंशन (सीबीडी), राष्ट्रीय जैव-विविधता कार्य योजना (एनबीएपी)
10.	डॉ. सुजाता अरोड़ा, अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24361601 sujata@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 737	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - राष्ट्रीय पर्यावरण सुरक्षा प्राधिकरण (एनईपीए)
11.	श्री एन. मुरुगानन्दम, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361487 इंटरकॉम सं. 122	
12.	डॉ. एस के अग्रवाल, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24362434 skag@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 545	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (ईआईए) अधिसूचना का संशोधन एवं संबंधित मुद्दे
13.	डॉ. पी एल आहूजाराय, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24363973 plahujarai@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 174	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - उद्योग परियोजनाओं का पर्यावरणीय मूल्य निर्धारण - खनन (गैर-कोयला) हेतु मूल्य निर्धारण समिति - एसईआईए और एसईएसी का गठन और उन पर अनुवर्ती कार्रवाई - तेल, गैस और पेट्रोलियम और डिस्टीलरीज क्षेत्र सहित औद्योगिक परियोजनाएं - नेशनल नेचुरल रिसोर्स मैनेजमेंट सिस्टम (एनएनआरएमएस) के अंतर्गत अनुसंधान प्रस्ताव - ईआरसी-प्रदूषण निवारण, नियंत्रण और उपशमन से संबंधित परियोजनाओं से संबंधित स्कीम - लागत के लाभों के विश्लेषण, सामाजिक, आर्थिक मुद्दों, विधिक और नीति संबंधित मामलों के संबंध में सामाजिक और आर्थिक विशेष प्रकरण समूह - प्रदूषण निवारण, नियंत्रण और उपशमन पर विशेष प्रकरण समूह - प्रभाग सीईएमडीई का समन्वय कार्य
14.	डॉ. जगराम, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24367640 jagram@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 739	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ई-गवर्नेंस
15.	श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361613 Kro63@ifs.nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 116	
16.	श्री भारत भूषण, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360795 Bbhushan98@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 534	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - निमार्ण परियोजनाएं - संसद संबंधी मामलों का समन्वय, वरिष्ठ अधिकारियों की बैठक और व्यय विवरण हेतु सूचना का मिलान करना
17.	डॉ. टी चांदनी, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24363963 tchand2003@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 172 कमरा नं. 1027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - कोयला खनन परियोजनाओं का पर्यावरणीय प्रभाव मूल्यांकन - सेन्टर ऑफ माइनिंग एनवायरमेंट (सीएमई), धनबाद - क्षेत्र विशिष्ट ईआईए मैनुअल/दिशा-निर्देश के विकास हेतु प्रस्तावों की समीक्षा करना और संस्थानों को निधियाँ जारी करना
18.	डॉ. पी. बी. रस्तोगी, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24367668 pb.rastogi@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 550	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - पर्यावरण प्रभाव मूल्यांकन औद्योगिक परियोजना - पर्यावरणीय परामर्शदाता को प्राधिकृत करना और क्यू.सी.आइ. के साथ समन्वय स्थापित करना।

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19.	डॉ. एस कौल, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360492 26178917(R) kaul52@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 602	- उड़ीसा, केरल, कर्नाटक, झारखंड, आंध्र प्रदेश, बिहार, मध्य प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र, त्रिपुरा, उत्तराखंड, मेघालय, तमिलनाडु, गुजरात और चंडीगढ़ संघ शासित प्रदेश को छोड़कर अन्य राज्यों में नमभूमियों का संरक्षण और प्रबंधन - रामसर कन्वेंशन
20.	डॉ. (श्रीमती) रंजनी वारियर, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24363964 warrier@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 530	- आनुवंशिक इंजीनियरिंग अनुमोदन समिति (जोईएसी) - जैव सुरक्षा पर कार्टिजेना प्रोटोकॉल - जैव-सुरक्षा पर क्षमता निर्माण परियोजना
21.	डॉ. नसीम अहमद, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24363677 naseem552004@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 927	- पारिप्रणाली अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम से संबंधित परियोजनाओं के लिए वित्तीय सहायता - पूर्वी तथा पश्चिमी घाट कार्यक्रम से संबंधित परियोजनाओं हेतु वित्तीय सहायता - प्राकृतिक संसाधनों के सतत उपयोग और संरक्षण पर विशेषज्ञ प्रकरण समूह (ए)(पारिप्रणाली अनुसंधान और पूर्वी और पश्चिमी घाटों के प्रस्तावों पर विचार करने के लिए)
22.	डॉ. जे.आर. भट्ट, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24363962 jrbhatt@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 546	- अखिल भारतीय वर्गिकी क्षमता निर्माण परियोजना कच्छ वनस्पतियों और प्रवाल भित्तियों के संरक्षण हेतु राज्य सरकारों को वित्तीय सहायता - प्राकृतिक संसाधनों (मानव और जैव मंडल कच्छ वनस्पतियां और प्रवाल भित्तियों, नमभूमियों और जैव विविधता आदि पर प्रस्तावों पर विचार करना) संरक्षण और सतत उपयोगिता पर थीमेटिक एक्सपर्ट ग्रुप (बी) - वर्गिकी पर राष्ट्रीय पुरस्कार - फाऊंडेशन फॉर रिवाइटलाइजेशन ऑफ लोकल हैल्थ ट्रेडिशन (एफआरएलएचटी) - एआईसीओपीटीएक्स
23.	श्री विजय कुमार, निदेशक (सतर्कता)	दूरभाष सं. 24366841 kravij@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 535	सतर्कता से संबंधित मामले
24.	डॉ ए दुराईस्वामी, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24642176 ozone-mefi@nic.in	ओजोन सेल और मान्द्रियल प्रोटोकॉल
25.	डॉ आर. के. राय, निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24367669 ramakrai@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 612	- वानस्पतिक उद्यानों को सहायता - सेंटर ऑफ इकोलॉजिकल साइंसिज, बंगलौर, जैव विविधता संरक्षण - सामुदायिक सहभागिता के माध्यम से जैव-विविधता संरक्षण पर यू.एन.डी.पी. परियोजना
26.	डॉ एम. होता, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24367663 hota@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 914	- अंतर्राष्ट्रीय रसायनिक प्रबंध के प्रति रणनीतिक एग्रेच (एसएआईसीएम) - अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार में कतिपय परिसंकटमय रसायनिकों और कीटनाशकों हेतु पूर्व सूचित सहमति प्रक्रिया पर रॉटरडैम कन्वेंशन - जन दायित्व बीमा अधिनियम - नगर पालिका ठोस अपशिष्ट (प्रबंध और हथालन) नियमावली - पुनःचक्रित प्लास्टिक (प्रबंध और हथालन) नियमावली

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
27.	श्री अग्रिम कौशल, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24364642 agrim.k@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 704	व्यापार और पर्यावरण, पीसी प्रभाग
28.	श्री पंकज गर्ग, उप सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24360686 pankaj.garg@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 918	अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग और सतत विकास-II (आईसी और एसडी-II)
29.	सुश्री रेनु सी. देशपांडे, लेखा नियंत्रक	दूरभाष सं. 24361116 इंटरकॉम सं. 157	बजट प्रस्तावों की छानबीन-बजट अनुमानों को तैयार करना- योजनागत बजट के संबंध में योजना समन्वय से विचार-विमर्श करना-पूरक अनुदान मांगों में समाविष्ट करने के लिए प्रस्तावों की संवीक्षा-मंत्रालयों की शक्तियों के अंदर और मंत्रालयों की शक्तियों के बाहर, दोनों के संबंध में, प्रस्तावों की पुनर्विनियोजन प्रक्रिया आरंभ करना-अनुदान मांगे तैयार करना व मुद्रण प्रारूप/ऑडिट पैरा पर की गई कार्रवाई पर टिप्पण प्रस्तुत करना-सरकारी कर्मचारियों को ऋण के अंतर्गत निधियों की संवीक्षा और आबंटन-वेतन व अन्य भत्तों का संवितरण-सहायता-अनुदान का संवितरण-आवधिक व्यय विवरण आदि प्राप्त करना, रोकड़ अनुभाग
30.	श्री प्रदीप कुमार, उप सचिव	इंटरकॉम सं. 552	गैर-सरकारी संगठन प्रकोष्ठ (एनजीओसेल) (क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय (मुख्यालय) के प्रशासनिक मामलों सहित) इंदिरा प्रियदर्शनी वृक्ष मित्र पुरस्कार
31.	श्रीमती एस. घोष राय, उप सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24360772 saheli.ghosh@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 707	अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग और सतत विकास-I (आईसी और एसडी-I) पर्यावरण नीति और कानून, एनईपीए
32.	श्री मोहम्मद मुअज्जम, उप सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24365218 इंटरकॉम सं. 505	पर्यावरण शिक्षा (ईई)
33.	श्री नारायण दास, उप सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24367631 dass.narain@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 527	आरटीआई अधिनियम और आंतरिक कार्य अध्ययन ईकाई (आईडब्ल्यूएसयू)
34.	सुश्री गुर प्यारी अपर सलाहकार (आर्थिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24368843 gurpyari@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 925	आर्थिक प्रकोष्ठ के नीतिगत मामलों
35.	श्री अनिल कुमार वैज्ञानिक 'घ'	दूरभाष सं. 24363819 anilkumar@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 607	राष्ट्रीय सूचना केन्द्र
36.	डॉ ताशी वांग्डी अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360806 इंटरकॉम सं. 177	सात भू-दृश्य वाले राज्यों में बाह्य सहायता प्राप्त परियोजना (जैव विधिता संरक्षण और ग्रामीण आजीविका सुधार परियोजना)
37.	डॉ एस. भौमिक अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24362827 bhowmik@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 539	नदी घाटी क्षेत्र और पन विद्युत परियोजना
38.	श्रीमती ऊषा सुब्रामणियम अपर निदेशक	इंटरकॉम सं. 745	- राष्ट्रीय पर्यावरण सुरक्षा प्रशिक्षण और अनुसंधान संस्थान, हैदराबाद - राष्ट्रीय पर्यावरण फैलो कार्यक्रम

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
39.	डॉ के. सी. राठौर अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360789 rathore27@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 144	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई मानीटरी रिपोर्टों का मूल्यांकन - परियोजना प्रस्तावकों से प्राप्त द्विवार्षिक रिपोर्टों का तकनीकी मूल्यांकन - आईए प्रभाग की आंतरिक बैठकों सहित समन्वय गतिविधियां - मंत्रिमंडल सचिव को मन्थली डी ओ, आग्टीआई मामले और आंतरिक समन्वय बैठक
40.	डॉ ए. सेंथिल वेल अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360694 senthil.vel@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 744	तटीय प्रबंधन जोन, नीतिगत मामले
41.	श्री एस. सी. गरकोटी अपर निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360171 satish1962@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 551	पर्यावरणीय प्रभाव आकलन अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत खनन क्षेत्र की परियोजनाओं का मूल्यांकन
42.	डॉ (श्रीमती) मंजू रैना अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360270 mraina99@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - साझा बहिष्प्राव शोधन संयंत्र (सीईटीपी) - जल प्रदूषण - औद्योगिक प्रदूषण
43.	श्री आर. एन. जिंदल अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24366347 mjindal@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 556	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - स्रोत संविभाजन अध्ययन - माले घोषणा - वायु प्रदूषण, ध्वनि प्रदूषण और मानको को निर्धारित करना, लाभप्रद कोयला, वायु अधिनियम के अंतर्गत अपीलें करना, प्रदूषण उपशमन पर वर्किंग ग्रुप, न्यायालय के मामले
44.	डॉ आर. के. सूरी अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24361668 rk.suri@yahoo.co.uk इंटरकॉम सं. 913	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - निवारणात्मक कार्यनीतियों के माध्यम से प्रदूषण उपशमन - ईको शहर - भूरे लाल प्राधिकरण - पारिस्थितिकी प्राधिकरण की क्षति - राष्ट्रीय पर्यावरणीय अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (एनईएए) - पुरस्कार - न्यायालय के मामले
45.	श्रीमती सुजाता खारडे अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360379 kharparde_sujata@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 557	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - पर्यावरण में अनुसंधान (आरई) - जैव-विविधता पर बी.पी पाल फेलोशिप अवार्ड - पर्यावरण पर पीताम्बर पंत फेलोशिप अवार्ड
46.	श्रीमती संचिता जिन्दल अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360488 sanson2859@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 752	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - फाऊंडेशन ऑफ रिवाइटेलाईजेशन ऑफ लोकल हेल्थ ट्रेडिशन (एफआरएलएचटी) से संबंधित मामले - औषधीय पादपों पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र विकास कार्यक्रम (यूएनडीपी) परियोजना - मंत्रालय के अन्य प्रभागों के साथ औषधीय पादपों पर समन्वय स्थापित करना
47.	डॉ एस. वी. रेड्डी अपर निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24366764 s.v.red1958_2000@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 753	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - क्षमता निर्माण औद्योगिक प्रदूषण प्रबंध परियोजना (सीबीआईपीएमपी) - मानव और जैव-मंडल रिजर्व कार्यक्रम

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
48.	श्रीमती रीता खन्ना अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24367664 rita.khanna_2000@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 173	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - सेमिनारों/परिसंवादों/कार्यशालाओं के लिए वित्तीय सहायता की मंजूरी - व्यावसायिक सोसायटी/संस्थानों को सहायता अनुदान - पर्यावरण पर प्रकाशनों के लिए वित्तीय सहायता की मंजूरी - पुस्तकालय से संबंधित सभी कार्य - ग्लोबल लर्निंग एण्ड ऑबसेरवेशन्स टू बेनिफिट द एनवायरमेंट (ग्लोब) कार्यक्रम. - राष्ट्रीय हरित कोर (एनजीसी), - मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय, एनसीईआरटी और राज्य शिक्षा विभागों के साथ समन्वय सहित औपचारिक पर्यावरण शिक्षा - व्यावसायिक पाठ्यक्रमों में पर्यावरण को सुदृढ़ बनाना इंदिरा गांधी राष्ट्रीय मुक्त विद्यालय के माध्यम से पर्यावरण एप्रिशियेशन पाठ्यक्रम
49.	डॉ एम सलाहुद्दीन अपर निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24364595 msal2000@hotmail.com इंटरकॉम सं. 743	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - स्वच्छ प्रौद्योगिकी विकास और मध्यम/लघु स्तरीय उद्योगों को बढ़ावा देना - अपशिष्ट न्यूनीकरण - देश भर में न्यूनतम अपशिष्ट सर्कल्स स्थापित करना
50.	डॉ एस. सत्यथी संयुक्त निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361795 इंटरकॉम सं. 601	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - जलवायु परिवर्तन पर राष्ट्रीय कार्य योजना एनएपीसीसी - जलवायु परिवर्तन के प्रभावों पर विशेषज्ञ समिति - उनके कार्यक्षेत्र से संबंधित मंत्रीमंडल मामले/प्रधान मंत्री के संदर्भ/संसदीय प्रश्न - आईपीसीसी, अनकूलन मुद्दे, जलवायु परिवर्तन से संबंधित सीएम्डी, नेटकॉम उप-समूह
51.	सुश्री प्रकृति श्रीवास्तव संयुक्त निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361795 jd-wl@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 717	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - वन्यजीव कन्वेंशन ऑन इंटरनेशनल ट्रेड ऑन इंडेन्जर्ड स्पीसीज (सीआईटीईएस), हाथी परियोजना, राष्ट्रीय उद्यान और अभयारण्य, - बर्ड फ्लू (एवियन इनफ्लुएंजा) - गिर्य संरक्षण - पुरस्कार और फैलोशिप आदि - विश्व बैंक और खाद्य कृषि संगठन (एफएओ) परियोजनाएं - वन्यजीव का संरक्षण और प्रबंध पर थीमेटिक दल
52.	श्री एच. एस. मालवीय अपर निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24367076 hsmalviya@gmail.com इंटरकॉम सं. 175	औद्योगिक परियोजनाओं का पर्यावरण प्रभाव आकलन
53.	सुश्री मधुमिता बिस्वास संयुक्त निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24363960 mbiswas2000in@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 750	पर्यावरण सूचना प्रणाली (एनविस) केन्द्र
54.	श्री एल. के. बोकोलिया संयुक्त निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24366017 lk.bokolia@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 626	दिल्ली, तमिलनाडु और पश्चिम बंगाल के राष्ट्रीय नदी संरक्षण योजना (एनआरसीपी) कार्य, पश्चिम बंगाल के राष्ट्रीय झील संरक्षण योजना (एनएलसीपी) कार्य

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
55.	श्री नीरज खत्री उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24365199 इंटरकॉम सं. 146 neeraj.khatri@nic.in	- पर्यावरणीय स्वास्थ्य - फ्लाई ऐश - पारिस्थितिकीय रूप से संवेदनशील क्षेत्र दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय के पारिअवक्रमित तंत्र के प्रबंधन हेतु उत्कृष्टता केन्द्र
56.	श्री बाबू लाल उप निदेशक	इंटरकॉम सं. 804/809 b.lal33@yahoo.in	हिंदी (राजभाषा)
57.	डॉ पी. एस. रावत उप निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360974 इंटरकॉम सं. 502 psrawat-net@nic.in	इन्दिरा गांधी पर्यावरण पुरस्कार जवाहरलाल नेहरू युनिवर्सिटी (जेएनयू) चेयर ऑन एनवायमेंटल लॉ और पर्यावरण सूचना प्रणाली (एनविस) स्कीम के कार्य
58.	श्री संजय कुमार सिंह उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24366978 इंटरकॉम सं. 127 Sanjaysing_sk@ rediffmail.com	उत्तर-प्रदेश, हरियाणा, राजस्थान, पंजाब, हिमाचल प्रदेश के एनआरसीपी कार्य जेआईसीए अध्ययन, जम्मू और कश्मीर के राष्ट्रीय झील संरक्षण योजना कार्य
59.	श्री अजय राघव उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24363735 इंटरकॉम सं. 125 ajay.raghava@nic.in	गंगा कार्य योजना (जीएपी), एनआरसीपी का मूल्यांकन, यमुना कार्य योजना (वायएपी)-II का संपूर्ण कॉम्बीनेशन, प्रचार, पीपीएण्डए के सभी कार्य, मीडिया और सामान्य मामले, उत्तराखंड और गोवा के एनआरसीपी कार्य और उत्तराखंड और गोवा के एनएलसीपी कार्य
60.	श्री एस. के. श्रीवास्तव उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24365199 इंटरकॉम सं. 147 sksmree@yahoo.com	राष्ट्रीय झील संरक्षण योजना समन्वय, जम्मू कश्मीर, उत्तराखंड और पश्चिम बंगाल को छोड़कर अन्य सभी राज्यों के राष्ट्रीय झील संरक्षण योजना कार्य, अनुसंधान और विकास परियोजनाएं, सैडीमेन्ट्स और विश्लेषणत्मक गुणवत्ता नियंत्रण सहित राष्ट्रीय नदी संरक्षण योजना के अंतर्गत नदियों की जल गुणवत्ता मानीटरिंग, सीवेज शोधन संयंत्रों की कार्यनिष्पादन मानीटरिंग
61.	डॉ. श्रुति राय उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360060 इंटरकॉम सं. 540 shruti.rai@nic.in	राष्ट्रीय नमभूमि संरक्षण कार्यक्रम (एनडब्ल्यूसीपी) के अंतर्गत नमभूमि (उड़ीसा, केरल कर्नाटक, झारखंड, आंध्र प्रदेश, बिहार, मध्य प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र, त्रिपुरा, उत्तराखंड, मेघालय, तमिलनाडु, गुजरात और चंडीगढ़ संघ शासित प्रदेश) स्लीम अली सेंटर फॉर ऑरनिथोलॉजी एण्ड नेचुरल हिस्ट्री (एसएसीओएन) नमभूमियों से संबंधित विकास और अनुसंधान, एनडब्ल्यूसीपी से संबंधित बजट के मामले, रामसर कन्वेंशन और नमभूमियों अंतर्राष्ट्रीय में वार्षिक अंशदान का भुगतान - सीएस प्रभाग भारतीय प्राणि सर्वेक्षण (जेडएसआई), भारतीय वानस्पतिक सर्वेक्षण (बीएसआई) और भारतीय गणराज्य का वानस्पतिक उद्यान (बीजीआईआर)
62.	श्री ई. थिरुनावाक्करसू उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360806 इंटरकॉम सं. 177 e.thirun@nic.in	- तटीय विनियमन जोन अधिसूचना 1991 (सीआरजेड) (अवसंरचना और विविध परियोजनाएं, पत्तन, बंदरगाह हवाई अड्डा, मार्ग रोपवेज, साझा बहिस्त्राव शोधन संयंत्र (सीईटीपी)), विपैले पदार्थ निपटान सुविधा (टीएसडीएफ)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
63.	श्री ओम प्रकाश उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361525 इंटरकॉम सं. 746 opkasana@rediffmail.com	गोआ, तमिलनाडु, आंध्र प्रदेश, केरल, महाराष्ट्र, छत्तीसगढ़ की खनन परियोजनाओं (गैर-कोयला) का पर्यावरण मूल्यांकन
64.	श्री डब्ल्यू. भारत सिंह उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24367257 इंटरकॉम सं. 549 w.bharat@nic.in	ताप विद्युत और नाभिकीय विद्युत परियोजनाएँ
65.	श्री आर. श्रीधर उप-निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24367622 Sridharaanug@gmail.com	जैव-चिकित्सीय अपशिष्ट (प्रबंध और हथालन) नियमावली, 1998 जैव-चिकित्सीय अपशिष्ट प्रबंध पर जागरूकता और प्रशिक्षण कार्यक्रमों को आयोजित करना, खतरनाक अपशिष्ट (प्रबंध हथालन और सीमापारीय संचालन) नियमावली, 1998 न्यायालय के मामलों की मानीटरी
66.	श्री शरद उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360792 Sharad_sapra@yahoo.com	रसायनिक आपदा प्रबंधन, रसायनिक दुर्घटना नियमावली, रसायनिक सुरक्षा, राष्ट्रीय अपदा प्रबंध प्राधिकरण, स्टॉकहोम कन्वेंशन अंतरराष्ट्रीय रसायनिक प्रबंध के प्रति रणनीतिक एग्रेस (एसएआईसीएम), रॉटरडैम कन्वेंशन, पूर्व सूचित सहमति (पीआईसी) प्रक्रिया के तहत परियोजना प्रस्ताव का मूल्यांकन, प्लास्टिक प्रबंध और उपयोग नियमावली जिसमें पेपर अपशिष्ट का आयात शामिल है, नगरपालिका ठोस अपशिष्ट (प्रबंध और हथालन) नियमावली, जनदायित्व बीमा अधिनियम/नियमावली, ईआरएफ स्कीम
67.	श्री पंकज वर्मा उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24363982 इंटरकॉम सं. 506 envpankaj@notmail.com	वायु प्रदूषण, ध्वनि प्रदूषण, जल प्रदूषण/साझा बहिष्प्राव शोधन संयंत्र (सीईटीपी) और औद्योगिक प्रदूषण
68.	श्री योगेन्द्र पाल सिंह उप निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360695 इंटरकॉम सं. 103 yogi_friends@yahoo.co.in	वन्यजीव अनुसंधान/परामर्श दात्री, बर्ड फ्लू (एचयन इनफ्लुएन्जा), गिद्ध संरक्षण, पुरस्कार और फैलोशिप आदि विषय बैंक और खाद्य कृषि संगठन (एफएओ) परियोजना, वन्यजीव का संरक्षण और प्रबंध और पशु कल्याण पर थीमेटिक दल
69.	श्री मनोज कुमार ई ई (योजना)	दूरभाष सं. 24363248 इंटरकॉम सं. 734 epzccu-mef@nic.in	सिविल निर्माण एकक (सीसीयू)
70.	श्री जफरुल इस्लाम अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24362612 इंटरकॉम सं. 603/910 Zafar_mef@nic.in	प्रदूषण नियंत्रण (सीपी)
71.	श्री सी. उप्पीलि अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24363553 इंटरकॉम सं. 124 uppili@yahoo.com	राष्ट्रीय नदी संरक्षण निदेशालय (एनआरसीडी)
72.	श्री डी. पी. सिंह अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24367158 इंटरकॉम सं. 180	वन से संबंधित वित्त (एफएफ)
73.	श्री ओ. पी. जोशी अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 23318554 जे.पी.बिल्डिंग	पशु कल्याण (एडब्ल्यू प्रभाग)
74.	श्री बी. बी. बब्बर अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24361722 इंटरकॉम सं. 703	राष्ट्रीय वनीकरण पारि-विकास बोर्ड (एनईबी)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
75.	श्री अशोक बंसल अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24367197 इंटरकॉम सं. 169	एकीकृत प्रभाग (आईएफडी)
76.	श्री डी. सी. शर्मा अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24364901 इंटरकॉम सं. 128	राष्ट्रीय नदी संरक्षण निदेशालय (एनआरसीडी)
77.	श्री एम. एल. वाधवानी अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24362909 इंटरकॉम सं. 915 wadhvani@yahoo.co.in	कार्मिक-1 (पी-1)
78.	श्रीमति प्रेमा मोहन अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24366693 इंटरकॉम सं. 912 Prema.mohan@nic.in	कार्मिक-2 (पी-2)
79.	श्री यू. चटर्जी अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24361057 इंटरकॉम सं. 129	एनआरसीडी
80.	श्री बी. के. श्रीवास्तव अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 26101710 subdivision@gmail.com	सर्वेक्षण और उपयोगिता (एसयू)
81.	श्री मालती रावत अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24363983 इंटरकॉम सं. 510 maltirama@gmail.com	वन स्थापना (एफई)
82.	श्री एच. के. श्रीवास्तव अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24360353 इंटरकॉम सं. 718	एनईबी
83.	श्री कमल किशोर अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24363983 इंटरकॉम सं. 511	भारतीय वन सेवा-1 (आईएफएस-1)
84.	श्री दीपक गोवर अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24362513 इंटरकॉम सं. 714 Bb_babar@yahoo.com	एनईबी
85.	श्री सी. एम. शर्मा अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24364303 इंटरकॉम सं. 509	भारतीय वन सेवा (आईएफएस-2)
86.	श्री जोसेफ लुईखाम अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24360419 इंटरकॉम सं. 559 j_luikam@nic.in	आईएफएस-2
87.	श्री बी. एस. भंडारी अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 243622920 इंटरकॉम सं. 911 Bs.bhandari@nic.in	पी-3 और पीजी प्रकोष्ठ
88.	श्री एस. महापात्र अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24363021 इंटरकॉम सं. 924 Satyamaha2006@yahoo.co.in	सामान्य प्रशासन (जीए)
89.	श्री जे. श्रीरमण अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24360806 इंटरकॉम सं. 177 e.thirun@nic.in	-एनएमएनएच और व्यापार यूरोपीय संघ सहित अन्य देशों के साथ जलवायु परिवर्तन पर द्विपक्षीय सहयोग -प्रभाग में सामान्य समन्वय -वरिष्ठ अधिकारियों की बैठक (एसआएम) -बजट अनुमानों की तैयारी और आर्थिक प्रभाग -प्रभाग में वित्तीय और प्रशासनिक समन्वय -भारत-यूरोपीय संघ और द्विपक्षीय मामले
90.	श्रीमती रीटा तयाल अवर सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24367076 इंटरकॉम सं. 175	जीसी, संसद और प्रोटोकॉल

सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 की धारा 19(1) के तहत अपीलीय प्राधिकरण के रूप में नापोहिष्ट अपर सचिव/संयुक्त सचिव/उप महानिरीक्षक/निदेशक/अपर निदेशक/उप सचिव स्तर के अधिकारी

क्रम सं.	पदनाम	दूरभाष सं.	विषय सामग्री
(क)	(ख)	(ग)	(घ)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	श्री सौरभ चन्द्रा अपर सचिव/वित्तीय सलाहकार	दूरभाष सं. 24362388 chandas@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 437	रोकड़ अनुभाग, वेतन एवं लेखा कार्यालय
2.	श्री ए. के. गोयल संयुक्त सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24361774 फैक्स सं. 24367009 इंटरकॉम सं. 440 akg@nic.in	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों की स्थापना, ई-गवर्नेंस कार्टिजेना प्रोटोकॉल सहित जैव-सुरक्षा, अनुवंशिक इंजीनियरी अनुमोदन समिति (जीईएसी) राष्ट्रीय जैव विविधता प्राधिकरण (एनबीए), राष्ट्रीय जैव विविधता कार्यनीति और कार्य-योजना (एनबीएसएपी), जैवीय विविधता पर कन्वेंशन (सीबीडी), उड़ीसा, केरल, कर्नाटक, झारखंड, आंध्र प्रदेश, विहार, मध्य प्रदेश, महाराष्ट्र, त्रिपुरा, उत्तराखंड, मेघालय, तमिलनाडु, गुजरात और चंडीगढ़ संघ शासित प्रदेश के अलावा अन्य राज्यों में नमभूमियों का संरक्षण और प्रबंध, रामसर कन्वेंशन, आईडब्ल्यूएसयू, आरटीआई अधिनियम, 2005
3.	डॉ बी. पी. नीलरत्न संयुक्त सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24361712 jsbpn-mef@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 422	प्रवाल भित्तियां, कच्छ वनस्पति, फाउंडेशन ऑफ रिवाइटेलाइजेशन ऑफ लोकल हेल्थ ट्रेडिशन (एफआरएलएचटी), ओजोन सेल और मॉन्डीयल प्रोटोकॉल, सीईएस/आईआईएससी, बंगलौर, हिन्दी (राजभाषा)
4.	श्री रजनी रंजन रश्मि संयुक्त सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24362281 rr.rashmi@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 408	जलवायु परिवर्तन (सीसी)(सीडीएम और यूएनएफसीसीसी सहित), सतर्कता, मोडिया
5.	डॉ रजनीश दूबे संयुक्त सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24363956 r.dube@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 414	स्वच्छ उत्पादन/स्वच्छ प्रौद्योगिकी, सतत विकास (एसडी)
6.	डॉ एच. के. पाण्डेय संयुक्त सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24362551 hempande@hotmail.com इंटरकॉम सं. 627	जी.बी. पंत हिमालयी पर्यावरण एवं विकास संस्थान (जी.बी.पी.आई. एच.ई.डी), अंतर राष्ट्रीय समेकित पर्वतीय विकास केन्द्र (आईसी आईएमओडी), अंतर राष्ट्रीय सहयोग (आईसी)
7.	श्री राजीव गोबा संयुक्त सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24360634 इंटरकॉम सं. 415	खतरनाक पदार्थ प्रबंध प्रभाग (एचएसएमडी), राष्ट्रीय झील संरक्षण योजना (एनएलसीपी) और पीएल
8.	श्री अंसार अहमद वन महानिरीक्षक (एफसी)	दूरभाष सं. 24362698 ansarahmed51@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 115	वन संरक्षण (एफसी), क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय (आर.ओ.)
9.	श्री आर. के. गोयल वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 24367652 Goel1977@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 443	बाह्य सहायता प्राप्त परियोजना (ईएपी) और पूर्वोत्तर राज्य प्रकोष्ठ
10.	श्री राजेश गोपाल वन महानिरीक्षक और निदेशक (एनटीसीए)	दूरभाष सं. 23384428 dirpt-r@nic.in	राष्ट्रीय बाघ संरक्षण प्राधिकरण (एनटीसीए) से संबंधित सभी मामले

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11.	श्री ए. एन. प्रसाद वन महानिरीक्षक व निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360957 gajendra@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 113	हाथी प्रयोजना, भारतीय वन्यजीव संस्थान और वन्यजीव अपराध प्रकोष्ठ
12.	श्री आर. मेहता सलाहकार	दूरभाष सं. 24362840 rmehta@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 543	पुस्तकालय, ग्लोबल पब्लिक गुड्स पर्यावरणीय शिक्षा (ईई)
13.	डॉ. जी. वी. सुब्रामणियम सलाहकार (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24364594 gvs moef 2005@ yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 548	पर्यावरण में अनुसंधान (आरई), वानस्पतिक उद्यानों को सहायता, वार्गिकी में क्षमता निर्माण पर अखिल भारतीय समन्वित परियोजना, (एआईसीओपीटीएक्स), एनटिटिस ऑफ इनकम्पेयेरेबल वैल्यू रेग्यूलेशन, राष्ट्रीय प्राकृतिक विज्ञान संग्रहालय (एनएमएनएच)
14.	डॉ. नलिनी भट्ट सलाहकार	दूरभाष सं. 24360478 nalini. bhat @ nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 541	उद्योग क्षेत्र से संबंधित प्रभाव मूल्यांकन, अवसंरचना, नदी घाटी, खनन क्षेत्र और तटीय विनियमन जोन (सी आर जेड)
15.	डॉ. जी.के. पांडे सलाहकार	दूरभाष सं. 24360467 Pandey@menf.delhi.nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 531	भवन निर्माण क्षेत्र से संबंधित प्रभाव मूल्यांकन कोयला खनन क्षेत्र का प्रभाव मूल्यांकन, पर्यावरणीय स्वास्थ्य, विश्व बैंक औद्योगिकीय विकास क्षमता परियोजना, रोटर्डेम कन्वेंशन, स्ट्रेटिजिक अप्रोच टू इंटरनेशनल केमिकल्स मैनेजमेंट (एसएआईसीएम), स्टॉकहोम कन्वेंशन (प्रभावी मूल्यांकन और पी ओ पी संवीक्षा समिति) पारा सहित भारी धातुएं।
16.	डॉ. सुबोध कुमार शर्मा सलाहकार	दूरभाष सं. 24360861 suboodh kumar@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 112	नेशनल कॅम्प्यूनीकेशन्स (एनएटीसीओएम). आई पी सी सी (जलवायु परिवर्तन पर अंतर-सरकारी पैनल) और जलवायु परिवर्तन से संबंधित सभी अन्य वैज्ञानिक/तकनीकी कार्य
17.	श्री आर.एस. अहलावत आर्थिक सलाहकार	दूरभाष सं. 24362663 इंटरकॉम सं. 908 rsahlawat-mef@nic.in	पीसी प्रभाग सहित आर्थिक प्रकोष्ठ के नीतिगत मामले
18.	श्री नीलकान्त घोष सांख्यिकीय सलाहकार	इंटरकॉम सं. 906	पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्रालय की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट, 'पर्यावरण स्थिति' रिपोर्ट, पर्यावरणीय सूचना (इन्दिरा गांधी पर्यावरण पुरस्कार को छोड़कर), सांख्यिकीय प्रकोष्ठ, एनजीओ प्रकोष्ठ
19.	श्री अरविन्द एम. सिंह उप वन महानिरीक्षक (एसयू)	विज्ञान सदन, आर. के. पुरम, दूरभाष सं. 26101178 arvindmsingh@yahoo.com	सर्वेक्षण और उपयोगिता, अंतराष्ट्रीय उष्ण-कटिबंधीय इमारती लकड़ी संगठन (आईटीटीओ), वानिकी सांख्यिकी
20.	श्रीमती रंजना गुप्ता उप वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 24360549 ranjanagupta2001@yahoo.com. इंटरकॉम सं. 431	वन नीति, एन एफ ए पी, वन अंतरराष्ट्रीय सहयोग (एफ आई सी) और राष्ट्रीय वन आयोग (एन एफ सी)
21.	श्री अनमोल कुमार उप वन महानिरीक्षक (डब्ल्यू एल)	aka6@indiatimes.com विज्ञान सदन, आर. के. पुरम, टेलीफोन नं. 26101157 इंटरकॉम सं. 113	वन्यजीव, वन्यजीव क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय विश्व धरोहर कन्वेंशन, राष्ट्रीय प्राणि-विज्ञान उद्यान, केन्द्रीय चिड़ियाघर प्राधिकरण, राष्ट्रीय वन्यजीव बोर्ड, अन्तरराष्ट्रीय संरक्षण संघ से संबंधित मामले। प्रवासी प्रजातियों पर कन्वेंशन, यूनेस्को, वन्यजीव अनुसंधान/परामर्शदात्री सेवाएं। वन्यजीव कन्वेंशन ऑन इंटरनेशनल ट्रेड ऑन इंडेन्जर्ड स्पीसीज (सीआईटीईएस), हाथी परियोजना, राष्ट्रीय उद्यान और अभयारण्य, बर्ड फ्लू (एवियन इनफ्लुएंजा) गिद्ध संरक्षण

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			पुरस्कार और फैलोशिप आदि । विश्व बैंक और खाद्य कृषि संगठन (एफएओ) परियोजनाएं वन्यजीव का संरक्षण और प्रबंध पर थीमेटिक दल ।
22.	श्री अशोक पई उप-वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 24362416 ashokepai@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 705	एन ए ई बी, एफ डी ए/एन ए पी (12 राज्य) वनीकरण से संबंधित नीतिगत मामले, 20 सूत्रीय कार्यक्रम, एम एण्ड ई, कम्प्यूनिक्शन एण्ड यूनाईटेड नेशन्स कन्वेंशन टू क्लाइमेट डेजरटिफिकेशन (यू एन सी सी डी) ।
23.	श्री ए. आर. चड्ढा उप-वन महानिरीक्षक (आर टी)	दूरभाष सं. 24364791 इंटरकॉम सं. 108	वानिकी अनुसंधान और प्रशिक्षण (आरटी), एशिया पैसिफिक फॉरेस्ट इनवेजन नेटवर्क (ए पी एफ आई एस एन), इंटरनेशनल नेटवर्क फार बैम्बू एण्ड रेटन (आईएनबीएआर), भारतीय वानिकी अनुसंधान और शिक्षा परिषद् (आईसीएफआरई), देहरादून, भारतीय वन सर्वेक्षण (एफएसआई) देहरादून, इन्दिरा गांधी राष्ट्रीय वन अकादमी (आईजीएनएफए) देहरादून, वन शिक्षा निदेशालय (डीएफई) देहरादून के प्रशासनिक और वित्तीय मामले तथा भारतीय प्लाईवुड उद्योग अनुसंधान और प्रशिक्षण संस्थान (आईपीआईआरटीआई), बंगलौर तथा भारतीय वन प्रबंध संस्थान (आईआईएफएम) भोपाल के सभी मामले ।
24.	श्री ए. के. जौहरी उप-वन महानिरीक्षक	दूरभाष सं. 24362016 इंटरकॉम सं. 102 johari60@yahoo.com	वन सुरक्षा प्रभाग (एफपीडी) और संयुक्त वन प्रबंध (जेएफएम) प्रकोष्ठ, जलवायु परिवर्तन पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र फ्रेमवर्क कन्वेंशन (यूएनएफसीसीसी) के अंतर्गत एल्यूएल्यूसीएफ, गैर-इमारती लकड़ी वन उत्पाद ।
25.	डॉ. रशीद हसन निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360734 hasan-mef@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 740	सी पी प्रभाग, वाहनीय प्रदूषण
26.	डॉ. एम. सुब्बा राव निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24361410 wowsubbarao@yahoo.co.in इंटरकॉम सं. 738	-जैव चिकित्सा अपशिष्ट प्रबंध (प्रबंध एवं हथालन) नियमावली पोत भंजन मामले -1995 से लॉबित पड़े हुए परिसंकटमय अपशिष्ट के प्रबंधन के संबंध में उच्चतम न्यायालय का मामला -परिसंकटमय अपशिष्ट के प्रबंधन पर उच्चतम न्यायालय की मानोटीरी समिति -अपशिष्ट तेल/प्रयुक्त तेल और नॉन-फेरस मेटेलिक अपशिष्टों के रिसाईक्लर्स का पंजीकरण -अपशिष्ट तेल/प्रयुक्त तेल का पुनः चक्रण -सुरक्षित और पर्यावरणीय दृष्टि के अनुकूल पोत के पुनःचक्रण पर अंतरराष्ट्रीय कन्वेंशन से संबंधित अंतरराष्ट्रीय मेट्रीटार्डिंग संगठन (आईएमओ) की समुद्री पर्यावरण सुरक्षा समिति (एम ई पी सी) -एच एस एम डी का समन्वय
27.	डॉ. ई. वी. मूले निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24364593 evmuley@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 558	भारतीय वनस्पति सर्वेक्षण (वी एस आई), भारतीय प्राणी सर्वेक्षण (जेड एस आई), भारतीय गणराज्य का वानस्पतिक उद्यान (बी जी आई आर)
28.	डॉ. एस. कौल निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360492 26178917 (आ.)	राष्ट्रीय नमभूमि संरक्षण कार्यक्रम (एनडब्ल्यूसीपी) के अंतर्गत नमभूमि (उड़ीसा, केरल कर्नाटक, झारखंड, आंध्र प्रदेश, बिहार, मध्य प्रदेश,

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		kaul52@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 602	महाराष्ट्र, त्रिपुरा, उत्तराखंड, मेघालय, तमिलनाडु, गुजरात राज्य और चंडीगढ़ संघ शासित प्रदेश) सलीम अली सेन्टर फॉर ऑरनिथोलॉजी एण्ड नेचुरल हिस्ट्री (एसएसीओएन) नमभूमियों से संबंधित विकास और अनुसंधान, एनडब्ल्यूसीपी से संबंधित बजट के मामले, रामसर कन्वेंशन और नमभूमियों अंतराष्ट्रीय में वार्षिक अंशदान का भुगतान
29.	डॉ. सरोज निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24364067 Sarojmoef@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 751	-एच एस एम डी -बेसल कन्वेंशन -खतरनाक अपशिष्ट (प्रबंध एवं हथालन), नियमावली, बैटरीज (प्रबंधन एवं हथालन) नियमावली, खतरनाक अपशिष्टों की सीमापार आवाजाही के नियंत्रण पर बेसल कन्वेंशन -डीजीएफटी मामलों सहित खतरनाक अपशिष्टों का आयात-निर्यात -ई-अपशिष्ट पर कार्य बल सहित ई, अपशिष्ट -लेड एसिड बैटरीज (प्रबंध और हथालन) नियमावली -अधिकतम दुर्घटना जोखिम (एम ए एच) इकाई में रासायनिक सुरक्षा -परसिसटेन्ट ऑर्गेनिक पॉल्यूटेन्ट्स (पी ओ पी) पर स्टॉकहोम कन्वेंशन राष्ट्रीय रसायनिक प्रबंध प्रोफाइल आई एफ ही (पर्यावरण)
30.	डॉ. (श्रीमती) चन्दा चौधरी निदेशक (वैज्ञानिक)	दूरभाष सं. 24360662 chhanda-c@yahoo.com इंटरकॉम सं. 741	
31.	श्री एस. जगन्नाथन निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361613 kr063@ifs.nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 116	
32.	श्री चंदन सिंह निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360678 chandana.singh@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 104	-वन स्थापना (एफ ई) पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्रालय के कर्मचारियों के लिए शिकायत अधिकारी
33.	श्री सतीश के. अग्रवाल, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24368442, 24362206 Satish.ka@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 140	राष्ट्रीय नदी संरक्षण निदेशालय (एन आर मी डी) प्रशामन, आई सी और प्रशिक्षण बजट का समन्वय, वार्षिक योजना, संसदीय मामलों/समितियों का समन्वय, एनआरसीए की समितियां, संसद प्रश्नों सहित एन आर सी पी/जी ए पी का समन्वय कार्य, सामान्य प्रकृति के मामले जिनमें समन्वय की आवश्यकता है, यमुना कार्य योजना का समन्वय, प्रचार, जन भागीदारी और मीडिया के कार्य
34.	श्री विवेक सक्सेना निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24362065 hr062@ifs.nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 435	भारतीय वन सेवा अधिकारियों की वार्षिक गोपनीय रिपोर्ट प्रक्रांन्ड और एजीएमयूटी संवर्ग का संवर्ग प्रबंध
35.	श्री अंजनी कुमार निदेशक (पशु कल्याण)	दूरभाष सं. 23318553 anjani.moef@yahoo.com anjani.srivastava@nic.in	पशु कल्याण प्रभाग और पर्यावरण और वन मंत्रालय की वेबसाइटों को अद्यतन बनाना/उनका विकास करना।
36.	श्री ए. के. लाल निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24367077 इंटरकॉम सं. 503 aklal87@gmail.com	एजीएमयूटी संवर्ग को छोड़कर भारतीय वन सेवा (आईएफएम) का संवर्ग प्रबंधन

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
37.	श्री सुरेश प्रसाद चौबे, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24361952 csp12@indiatimes.com इंटरकॉम सं. 625	हिंदी (राजभाषा)
38.	डॉ. एम.ए. हक, निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360659 इंटरकॉम सं. 616 haque@nic.in	- पाणिस्थितिकीय रूप से संवेदनशील क्षेत्र - फ्लाई ऐश - अनुसंधान पर सामाजिक और आर्थिक मुद्दे
39.	डॉ आर.के. पाठक, तकनीकी निदेशक	दूरभाष सं. 24360465 इंटरकॉम सं. 465 rkpathak@nic.in	राष्ट्रीय सूचना केन्द्र
40.	श्री अश्विनी कुमार मिश्रा, उप सचिव	दूरभाष सं. इंटरकॉम सं. 917	वन, रा.व. पारि. विकास बोर्ड और वन्यजीव पर एकीकृत वित्त प्रभाग
41.	श्री आलोक अग्रवाल, उप सचिव	Alokagarwal63@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 704	प्रशासन (पी-I, पी-II, और पी-III), लोक शिकायत प्रकोष्ठ
42.	श्री नारायण दास, उप सचिव	दूरभाष सं. 24367631 इंटरकॉम सं. 527 dass.narain@nic.in	सामान्य समन्वय, जीए, प्रोटोकॉल और संसद
43.	श्री वी.के. जयसवाल, सुप्रि. इंजीनियर (सीसीयू)	दूरभाष सं. 24360588 seccu-mef@nic.in इंटरकॉम सं. 725	पर्यावरण और वन मंत्रालय और इसके विभागों, अधीनस्थ कार्यालयों और स्वायत्तशासी संस्थान जो सिविल निर्माण इकाई को सौंपे गए हैं उनके कार्यों की योजना और निष्पादन से संबंधित/संबद्ध मामले

III. ऐसे सभी अधिकारी जिनके पास जानकारी है और जो मामलों का निपटान कर रहे हों, वे वस्तुतः जन सूचना अधिकारी होंगे।

IV. मंत्रालय के लिंक अधिकारियों को नामोद्विष्ट किये जाने की व्यवस्था, सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम के तहत मामलों का निपटान कर रहे अपीलीय प्राधिकरणों/केन्द्रीय जन सूचना कार्यालयों को भी लागू होगी।

V. यह अधिसूचना मंत्रालय की दिनांक 17 जुलाई, 2009 की पूर्व अधिसूचना संख्या 1/2/2007 आर.सी.का. अधिकांत करती है।

[सं. 1/2/2009-आरसी]

ए. के. गोयल, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2009

S.O. 161.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 (1)/Section 19 (1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, the following officers of the Ministry of Environment and Forests are hereby designated as Central Public Information Officers/Appellate Authorities, etc., in respect of the specific subject matters mentioned against their names.

1. The following Officers are designated as Central Public Information Officers under Section 5 (1) of the Act. :

S. No.	Designation	Tele. No.	Subject Matter
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Shri S.P. Yadav, DIGF	T. No. 23389883 jdntca@gmail.com	All matters relating to National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA)
2.	Sh. B.K. Singh, AIGF	bk.singh38@hotmail.com Vigyan Sadhan, R. K. Puram T. No. 26101190	Forest Conservation (Andhra Pradesh, Chandigarh, Delhi, Haryana, Karnataka, M.P., Manipur, Meghalaya, Orissa, Pondicherry and Uttarakhand)
3.	Sh. Umakant, AIGF	T. No. 26101127 umakant1996@yahoo.co.in	Forest Conservation (Andaman & Nicobar, Assam, Sikkim, Kerala, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Punjab, Tamilnadu, U.P., West Bengal, Tripura)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4.	Ms. Shally Ranjan, AIG	T. No. 24361223 Intercom No. 444 shally.eap@gmail.com	Work related to Externally Aided Project (EAP) North East Cell (NE Cell) and Forest Protection Division (FPD), Joint Forest Management (JFM) Cell, LULUCF under United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Non-timber Forest Produce Research & Training (RT), Forest Policy (FP)
5.	Sh. Rajan Sehgal, AIG	T. No. 24362131 Intercom No. 109 aig-rtdig@yahoo.com	
6.	Shri C.D. Singh, AIGF	edsingh1987@rediffmail.com Vigyan Sadhan, R.K. Puram T. No. 26101153	Forest Conservation (Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattishgarh, Dadra Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Goa, Gujarat, H.P., Jharkhand, Mizoram, Rajasthan) Administrative matter of FC Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 Forest Advisory Committee Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA)
7.	Shri Vivek Saxena, Director	T. No. 24362065 vivekaxena@gmail.com Intercom No. 435	G.B. Pant Himalayan Institute of Environment Development (GBPHIED) & International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)
8.	Shri R. K. Sethi, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24362252 rksethi@nic.in Intercom No. 135	Kyoto Protocol, Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) including meetings of National CDM Authority, Issues relating to Mitigation, Technology Transfer and Energy Efficiency, Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate, Subsidiary Body on Scientific & Technical Advice (SBSTA), Consultative Sub-group on CDM & related issues, RTI Matters, Cabinet Matters/PMO references/Parliament Question relating to his area of work and other Parliamentary matters, Internet policy search on Climate Change Subsidiary Body of Implementation, Consultative Group on Climate Change including Political Sub-group, Sub-group, Climate Modelling Sub-group, Financing under UNFCCC, CoP MoP and other UNFCCC related meeting.
9.	Shri A. A. Rao, Director	T. No. 24361797 raoanacha@yahoo.co.in Intercom No. 182	(EE) Environmental Education Centre for Environment Education Ahmedabad -CPR Environmental Education Centre, Chennai -Setting up new Centres of Excellence National Environment Awareness campaign (NEAC) and Media Cell
10.	Dr. Sujata Arora, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24361601 sujata@nic.in Intercom No. 737	National Bio-diversity Authority (NBA), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) & National Bio-diversity Action Plan (NBAP)
11.	Sh. N. Muruganandam, Director	T. No. 24361487 Intercom No. 122	National Environment Protection Authority (NEPA)
12.	Dr. Satish Kumar Aggarwal, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24362434 skag@nic.in Intercom No. 545	Amendments of EIA Notification and related matters
13.	Dr. P. L. Ahuja Rai, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24363973 plahujarai@yahoo.com Intercom No. 174	Environmental appraisal of industry projects Appraisal Committee for Mining (non-coal) Constitution of SEIAAs and SEACs and follow up Industrial Projects including of oil, Gas and Petroleum and Distilleries sector.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14.	Dr. Jag Ram Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24367640 jagram@nic.in Intercom No. 739	Research proposals under National Natural Resource Management System (NNRMS) ERC scheme Projects relating to Pollution Prevention, Control and Abatement Social and Economic Thematic Group relating to Cost Benefit Analysis, Social Economic issues, Legal and Policy related matters Thematic Expert Groups Pollution Prevention, Control and Abatement Co-ordination work of the Division, CEMDE E-Governance
15.	Shri Surendra Kumar Director	T. No. 24361613 Kr063@ifs.nic.in Intercom No. 116	
16.	Shri Bharat Bhushan Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360795 Bbhushan98@yahoo.com Intercom No. 534	Construction Projects Co-ordination of Parliament related matters, compilation of information for Senior Officers meeting and expenditure statement
17.	Dr. T Chandni Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24363963 tchand2003@yahoo.co.in Intercom No. 172 Room No. 1027	Environment Impact Assessment of Coal Mining Project Centre of Mining Environment (CME), Dhanba Review of proposals for development of sector specific EIA Manual/Guidelines and release of funds to Institutions
18.	Dr. P. B. Rastogi Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24367668 pb.rastogi@nic.in Intercom No. 550	Environment Impact Assessment industrial project Accreditation of Environmental Consultant and co-ordination with QCI
19.	Dr. S. Kaul Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360492 kaul52@yahoo.com Intercom No. 602	Conservation and management of Wetlands in States of other than Orissa, Kerala, Karnataka, Jharkhand, AP, Bihar, MP, Maharashtra, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Meghalaya, T.N., Gujarat and UT of Chandigarh Ramsar Convention
20.	Dr. (Ms.) Ranjini Warrier, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24363964 warrier@nic.in Intercom No. 530	Genetic Engineering Approval Committee (GEAC) Cartagena Protocol on Bio-safety Capacity Building Project on Bio-safety
21.	Dr. Naseem Ahmed, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24363677 naseem552004@yahoo.co.in Intercom No. 927	Financial assistance for projects relating to Eco-system Research Programme Financial assistance for projects relating to Eastern and Western Ghats Programme Thematic Expert Group (A) on Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Natural Resource (to consider proposals on Eco-System Research and Eastern & Western Ghats)
22.	Dr. J. R. Bhatt, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24363962 jrbhatt@nic.in Intercom No. 546	All India Taxonomy Capacity Building Project Financial assistance to state Governments for conservation of mangroves and coral reefs Thematic Expert Group (B) on conservation & Sustainable Utilization of Natural Resources (to consider proposals on Man and Biosphere, Mangroves & Coral Reefs, Wetlands, and Bio-diversity, etc.) National Award for Taxonomy Foundation for Revitalization of Local Health Tradition (FRLHT) AICOPTAX

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
23.	Shri Vijay Kumar Director (Vig)	T. No. 24366841, kravij@yahoo.com Intercom No.535	Vigilance matters
24.	Dr. A Duraiswamy Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24642176, ozone-mef@nic.in	Ozone Cell & Montreal Protocol
25.	Dr. R. K. Rai Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24367669, ramakrai@yahoo.com Intercom No.612	Assistance to Botanic Gardens Centre of Ecological Sciences, Bangalore, Biodiversity Conservation UNDP Project on Biodiversity Conservation through Community participation
26.	Dr. M. Hota Director	Intercom No. 914, hota@inc.in T. No. 24367663	Strategic approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Rotterdam Convention on Prior informed consent Procedure for certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade Public Liability Insurance Act Municipal Solid Wastes (Management & Handling) Rules Recycled Plastic (Management & Handling) Rules. Trade and Environment, PC Division
27.	Sh. Agrim Kaushal Director	T. No. 24364642, Intercom No. 704 agrim.k@nic.in	
28.	Shri Pankaj Garg, Dy. Secretary	T. No. 24360686 pankaj.garg@nic.in Intercom No. 918	International Cooperation & Sustainable Development-II (IC & SD-II)
29.	Ms. Renu C. Deshpande, Controller of Accounts	T. No. 24361116 Intercom No. 157	Scrutiny of budget proposals Preparation of budget estimates Interaction with Plan Coordination regarding Plan Budget. Scrutiny of proposals for inclusion in Supplementary Demands for grants. Processing of Re-appropriation proposals both within the Powers of Ministry and beyond the Powers of Ministry. Preparation and Printing of Demands for Grants. Submission of Action Taken Notes on Draft/ Audit paras. Scrutiny and allocation of funds under loans to Government servants. Disbursal of salaries and other allowances Disbursal of Grants-in-aid-Taking out periodical expenditure statement etc. Cash Section Non Governmental Organization Cell (NGO Cell) Regional Offices (HQs) (including administrative matters of RO(HQ) IPVA
30.	Sh. Pradeep Kumar, Dy. Secretary	Intercom No. 552	
31.	Smt. S. Ghosh Roy, Dy. Secretary	T. No. 24360772 Intercom No. 707 saheli.ghosh@nic.in	International Cooperation & Sustainable Development I (IC & SD-I) Environment Policy and Law, NEPA

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
32.	Sh. Mohammad, Muazzam, Dy. Secretary	T. No. 24365218 Intercom No. 505	Environment Education (EE)	
33.	Sh. Narain Dass, Dy. Secretary	T. No. 24367631 Intercom No. 572 dass.narain@nic.in	RTI Act and Internal Work Study Unit (IWSU)	
34.	Mr. Gur Pyari, Addl. Adviser (Eco.)	T. No. 24368843 Intercom No. 952 gurpyari@nic.in	Policy matters of Economic Cell	
35.	Sh. Anil Kumar, Scientist 'D'	T. No. 24363819 Intercom No. 607 anilkumar@nic.in	National Informatics Centre	
36.	Dr. Tashi Wangdi, Addl. Director (S)	T. No. 24360806 Intercom No.	Externally Aided project (Biodiversity conservation and Rural Livelihood Improvement Project) in seven Landscapes state.	
37.	Dr. S. Bhowmik, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24362827 bhowmik@nic.in Intercom No. 539	River Valley and Hydro Electric projects.	
38.	Smt. Usha Subramaniam, Addl. Director	Intercom No. 745	-National Environment Protection Training and Research Institute, Hyderabad - National Environment Fellows. Programme - Evaluation of the monitoring reports submitted by Regional Offices. Technical appraisal of the biannual reports received from project proponents -Coordination activities, including the internal meetings of IA Division - Monthly D.O. to Cabinet Secretary, RTI matters and internal Coord Meeting	
39.	Dr. K.C. Rathore, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360789 rathore27@yahoo.com Intercom No. 144	Coastal Management Zone, Policy matters	
40.	Dr. A. Senthil Vel, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360694 senthil.vel@nic.in Intercom No. 744		
41.	Sh. S.C. Garkoti, Addl. Director	T. No. 24360171 Intercom No. 551 satish1962@yahoo.com	Appraisal of mining sector projects under the environmental impact assessment notification	
42.	Dr. (Mrs) Manju Raina, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360270 Mraina99@yahoo.com Intercom No. 117	-Common Effluent Treatment Plants (CETPs) -Water pollution - Industrial Pollution -Recognition of Laboratory	
43.	Shri R.N. Jindal, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24366347 rnjindal@yahoo.com Intercom No. 556	-Source Apportionment Studies -Male Declaration Air Pollution, noise pollution and setting of standards, coal beneficiation, appeals under Air Act, working group on pollution abatement, court matters.	
44.	Dr. R.K. Suri, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24361688 rk.suri@yahoo.co.uk Intercom No. 913	- abatement of Pollution through preventive strategies - Eco cities - Bhure Lal Authority - Loss of Ecology Authority - National Environmental Appellate Authorities (NEAA) - Awards - Court Matters	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
45.	Ms. Sujata Khaparde, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360379 khaparde sujata@yahoo. co. in Intercom No. 557	- Research in Environment (RE) B. P. Pal Fellowship Award on Bio-diversity - Pitamber Pant Fellowship Award on Environment
46.	Mrs. Sanchita Jindal, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360488 Intercom No. 752 Sansom 2859@yahoo.co in	- Matter relating to Foundation of Revitalization of Local Health Tradition (FRLHT) - United National Development Programme (UNDP) Projects on medicinal plants - Coordination on medicinal plants other divisions of the Ministry
47.	Dr. S. V. Reddy Addl. Director	T. No. 24366764 Intercom No. 753 s.v.red 1958 2000@yah co. com	- Capacity Building Industry Pollution Management Project (CBIPMP) - Man and Biosphere Reserves Programme
48.	Mrs. Rita Khanna Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24367664 rita khann 2000@yahoo. com Intercom No. 173 Room No. 1028	Grant of financial assistance for Seminars Symposia Workshops Grants-in aid to Professional Societies Institutions Grant of financial assistance for publications on Environment All work related to Library. Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) Programme -National Green Corps (NGC) -Formal Environment Education including Coordination with Ministry of Human Resources Development, NCERT and State Education Departments -Strengthening of Environment in Professional courses Environmental Appreciation courses through Indira Gandhi National Open University.
49.	Dr. M. Salahuddin, Addl. Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24364595 msal2000@hotmail.com Intercom No. 743	-Clean Technology developments and promotion for medium/small scale industries -Waste minimization -Establishment of Waste Minimization circles throughout the country
50.	Dr. S. Satpathy, Addl. Director	T. No. 24361795 Intercom No. 601	-National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC). -Expert Committee on Impacts of Climate Change, -Cabinet matters/PMO references Parliament Questions relating to his area of work -IPCC, Adaptation issues, CSD pertaining to Climate Change, Netcom Sub-Group
51.	Ms. Prakriti, Srivastava Joint. Director	T. No. 24361795 Intercom No. 717 prakriti 2000@yahoo.com	-Wildlife, Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species (CITES), Project Elephant, National Parks & Sanctuaries -Bird flu (Avian Influenza) -Vulture conservation. -Awards & fellowships, etc. -World Bank & Food Agriculture Organization (FAO) projects -Thematic Group on Conservation & Management of Wild Life.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
52.	Sh. H. S. Malyiya, Addl. Director	T. No. 24367076 Intercom No. 175 hsmalviya@gmail.com	Environment impact assessment of industrial projects
53.	Ms. Madhumita, Biswas Joint. Director	T. No. 24363960 Intercom No. 750 mbiswas2000in@yahoo.com	Environment Information System (ENVIS) Centres
54.	Sh. L. K. Bokolia, Joint. Director	T. No. 24366017 Intercom No. 626 lk.bokolia@nic.in	National River Conservation Plan (NRCP) works of Delhi, Tamil Nadu & West Bengal, National Lake Conservation Plan (NLCP) works of West Bengal
55.	Shri. Neeraj Khatri, Dy. Director	T. No. 24365199 Intercom No. 146 neeraj.khatri@nic.in	-Environmental Health -Fly Ash -Ecologically sensitive areas -Centre for Excellence for Mangement of eco-Degraded system of Delhi University
56.	Sh. Babulal, Ry. Director	Intercom No. 804/809 b.lal33@yahoo.in	Hindi (Official language)
57.	Dr. P. S. Rawat, Dy. Director (S)	T. No. 24360974 Psrawat-net@nic.in Intercom No. 502	Indira Gandhi Paryavaran Puraskar Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) Chair on environmental law and some work of Environment Information System (ENVIS) Scheme
58.	Sh Sanjay Kumar, Singh Dy. Director	T. No. 24366978 Intercom No. 127 Sanjaysingh sk@rediffmail.com	NRCP work of U. P. , Haryana, Rajasthan, Punjab, H.P. JICA Study, NLCP works of J & K
59.	Sh. Ajay Raghav, Dy. Director	T. No. 24362735 Intercom No. 125 ajay.raghava@nic.in	Evaluate of Ganga Action Plan (GAP), NRCP, complete combination of Yamuna Action Plan (YAP)-II, all works of Publicity, PP & A, Media and General matters NRCP works of Uttarakhand and Goa NLCP works of Uttarakhand and Goa
60.	Sh. S. K. Srivastava, Dy. Director	T. No. 24365199 Intercom No. 147 sksmree@yahoo.com	NLCP Co-ordination NLCP Co-ordination and works of NLCP for all states other than J & K, Uttarakhand & West Bengal R & D projects, Water Quality Monitoring of rivers under NRCP including sediments and Analytical Quality Control, Performance Monitoring of SYPs.
61.	Dr. Shruti Rai, Dy. Director	T. No. 24360060 Intercom No. 540 shruti.raai@nic.in	Wetlands under National Wetland Conservation Programme (NWCP) (in the States of Orissa, Kerala, Karnataka, Jharkhand, A.P., Bihar, M.P., Maharashtra, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Meghalaya, T. N., Gujrat and U.T. of Chandigarh). Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology & Natural History (SACON). R & D relating to Wetlands, Budget matters related to NWCP, Payment of annual contribution to Ramsar Convention and Wetlands International CS Division Zoological Survey of India (ZSI), Botanical Survey of India (BSI) & Botanical Garden of India Republic (BGIR)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
62.	Sh. E., Thirunavakkarsu Dy. Director	T. No. 24360806 Intercom No. 177 e.thirun@nic.in	Coastal regulation zone notification 1991 (CRZ), Infrastructure and miscellaneous projects Ports, harbours, airports, roads, ropeways, common effluent treatment plants (CETP), toxic substances disposal facility (TSDF)
63.	Sh. Om Prakash, Dy. Director	T. No. 24361525 Intercom No. 746 opkasana@rediffmail. co m	Environment appraisal of mining projects (non-coal) Goa, Tamil Nadu, AP, Kerala, Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh
64.	Sh. W. Bharat Singh, Dy. Director	T. No. 24367257 Intercom No. 549 w. Bharat @nic. in	Thermal & Nuclear power projects
65.	Dr. R. Sridhar, Dy. Director	T. No. 24367622 Intercom No. 544 Sridharaanug @gmail. com	Bio-medical Waste (Management and Hanling) Rules, 1998 Conducting awareness and training programmes on Bio-Medical Waste Management Management Hazardous Waste (Management Handling and Trans- boundary Movement) Rules, 1998 Monitoring of Court Cases
66.	Sh. Shard, Dy. Director	T. No. 24360792 Sharad sapra@yahoo.com	Chemical Disaster Management, Chemical Accident Rules, Chemical Safety, National Disaster Management Authority, Stockholm Convention Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Manage- ment (SAICM), Rotterdam Convention, Appraisal of Project Proposal under Prior Informed Consent (PIC) Procedure, Plastic Management and Usage Rules includ- ing Import of paper wastes, Municipal Solid Waste (Mgt. and Handling) Rules, Public Liability Insurance Act/Rules, ERF Scheme
67.	Sh. Pankaj Verma, Dy. Director	T. No. 24363982 Intercom No. 506 envpankaj@hotmail. com	Air Pollution, Noise Pollution, Water Pollution/Common Effluent Treatment Plant (CETPs) and Industrial Pollution
68.	Sh. Yogender Pal, Singh, Dy. Director	T. No. 24360695 Intercom No. 103 yogi friends @yahoo. co.in	Wildlife Research/consultancies, Bird flu (Avian Influenza), Vulture conservation, Awards & fellowships, etc. World Bank & Food Agriculture Organization (FAO) Projects, Thematic group on conservation & Management of Wild- Life and Animal Welfare
69.	Sh. Manoj Kumar, EE (Planning)	T. No. 24363248 Intercom No. 734 cp2ccu-mef@nic.in	Civil construction Unit (CCU)
70.	Sh. Zafrul Islam, Under Secretary	T. No. 24362612 Intercom No. 603/910 Zafar mef@nic.in	Control of Pollution (CP)
71.	Sh. C. Uppili, Under Secretary	T. No. 24363553 Intercom No. 124 uppili@yahoo.com	National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD)
72.	Sh. D.P. Singh, Under Secretary	T. No. 24367158 Intercom No. 180	Forest Finance (FF)
73.	Sh. O. P. Joshi, Under Secretary	T. No. 23318554 JP Building	Animal Welfare (AW) Division
74.	Sh. B. B. Babbar, Under Secretary	T. No. 23361722 Intercom No. 703	National Afforestation Eco-Development Board (NAEB)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
75.	Sh. Ashok Bansal, Under Secretary	T. No. 24361797 Intercom No. 169	Integrated Finance Division (IFD)
76.	Sh. D. C. Sharma, Under Secretary	T. No. 24364901 Intercom No. 128	National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD)
77.	Sh. M. L. Wadhvani, Under Secretary	T. No. 24362909 Intercom No. 915 wadhvani@yahoo.co.in	Personnel-I (P.I)
78.	Smt. Prema Mohan, Under Secretary	T. No. 24366693 Intercom No. 912 Prema.mohan@nic.in	Personnel-II (P.II)
79.	Sh. U. Chatterjee, Under Secretary	T. No. 24361057 Intercom No. 129	NRCD
80.	Sh. V. K. Srivastava, Under Secretary	T. No. 26101710 subdivision@gmail.com	Surveys and Utilization (SU)
81.	Smt. Malti Rawat, Under Secretary	T. No. 24363983 Intercom No. 510 maltiorama@gmail.com	Forest Establishment (FE)
82.	Sh. H.K. Srivastava, Under Secretary	T. No. 24360353 Intercom No. 718	NAEB
83.	Sh. Kamal Kishore, Under Secretary	T. No. 24363983 Intercom No. 511	Indian Forest Service-I (IFS-I)
84.	Sh. Deepak Grover, Under Secretary	T. No. 24362513 Intercom No. 714 Bb babar@yahoo.com	NAEB
85.	Sh. C. M. Sharma, Under Secretary	T. No. 24364303 Intercom No. 509	Indian Forest Service. II (IFS-II)
86.	Sh. Joseph Luikham, Under Secretary	T. No. 24360419 Intercom No. 559 jluikam@nic.in	IFS.II
87.	Sh. B.S. Bhandari, Under Secretary	T. No. 24362290 Intercom No. 911 Bs. bhandari@nic.in	P. III & P.G. Cell
88.	Sh. S. Mahapatra, Under Secretary	T. No. 24363021 Intercom No. 924 Satyamaha2006@yahoo.co.in	General Administration (GA)
89.	Sh. J. Sriraman, Under Secretary	T. No. 24360806 Intercom No. 177 e.thirun@nic.in	NMNH and Trade & Environment-Bilateral cooperation on Climate Change with other countries including EU. -General coordination in the Division -Senior Officer Meeting (SOM) -Preparation of Budget Estimates and coordination with Economic Division -Financial and administrative coordinate in the Division -India-EU and bilateral matters
90.	Smt. Rita Tayal Under Secretary	T. No. 24367076 Intercom No. 175	GC, Parliament and Protocol

Officer of the level of AS/JS/DIG/Director/Addl. Director/Dy. Secretary designated as Appellate Authorities under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act 2005

S. No.	Designation	Tele. No.	Subject Matter
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Shri Saurabh Chandra, AS & FA	T. No. 24362388 Intercom No. 437 chandas@nic.in	Cash Section, PAO
2.	Shri A. K. Goyal Joint Secretary	T. No. 24361774 Fax No. 24367009 Intercom No. 440 akg@nic.in	Establishment of Regional Offices, e-Governance, Bio-safety including Cartagena Protocol, Genetic Engineering Approval Committee (GEAC), National Bio-diversity Authority (NBA), National Bio-diversity Strategy & Action Plan (NBSAP), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Conservation and Management of Wetlands in States of Other than Orissa, Kerala, Karnataka, Jharkhand, AP, Bihar, MP, Maharashtra, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Meghalaya, T.N. Gujarat and UT of Chandigarh Ramsar Convention, IWSU, RTI Act, 2005
3.	Dr. B. P. Nilaratna, Joint Secretary	Tel. No. 24361712 jsbpn-mef@nic.in Intrcom No. 422	Coral Reefs, Mangroves, Foundation of Revitalization of Local Health Tradition (FRLHT), Ozone Cell & Montreal Protocol, CES/IISc, Bangalore
4.	Shri Rajani Ranjan Rashmi, Joint Secretary	T. No. 24362281 Intercom No. 408 rr.rashmi@nic.in	Climate Change (CC) (including CDM & UNFCCC) Vigilance, Media
5.	Dr. Rajneesh Dube, Joint Secretary	T. No. 24363956 r.dube@nic.in Intercom No. 414	Clean Production/Clean Technology, Sustainable Development (SD)
6.	Sh. H. K. Pande, Joint Secretary	T. No. 24362551 Intercom No. 627 hempande@hotmail.com	G. B. Pant Himalayan Institute of Environment Development (GBPHIED) & International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), International Cooperation (IC)
7.	Shri Rajiv Gauba, Joint Secretary	T. No. 24360634 Intercom No. 415	Hazardous Substances Management Division (HSMD), National Lake Conservation Plan (NLCP) & PL
8.	Shri Ansar Ahmed, IGF	T. No. 24362698 Intercom No. 115 ansarahmed51@yahoo.com	Forest Conservation (FC), Regional Officers (ROs)
9.	Sh. R. K. Goel IGF	T. No. 24367652 Intercom No. 443 Goel1977@nic.in	Externally Aided Project (EAP) & NE Cell
10.	Shri Rajesh Gopal, IGF & Director (NTCA)	T. No. 23384428 dirpt-r@nic.in	All matters relating to National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA)
11.	Shri A. N. Prasad, IGF & Director	T. No. 24360957 gajendra@nic.in Intercom No. 113	Project Elephant, Wildlife Institute of India and Wildlife Crime Cell
12.	Shri R. Mehta, Adviser	T. No. 24362840 rmehta@nic.in Intercom No. 543	Library, Global Public Goods Environmental Education (EE)
13.	Dr. G. V. Subrhamaniam Adviser	T. No. 24364594 Intercom No. 548 gvs moef2005@ yahoo.co.in	Research in Environment (RE), Assistant to Botanical Gardens, All India Coordinated Project on Capacity Building in Taxonomy (AICOPTAX), Entities of Incomparable Value Regulations, National Museum of Natural History (NMNH)
14.	Dr. Nalini Bhatt, Adviser	T. No. 24360478 nalini.bhat@nic.in Intercom No. 541	Impact Assessment relating to Industry sector, Infrastructure, River Valley, Mining Sectors and Coastal Regulation Zones (CRZ)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15.	Dr. G. K. Pandey, Adviser	T. No. 24360467 panday-mef@nic.in Intercom No. 531	Impact Assessment relating to Building Construction Sectors, Impact Assessment of Coal Mining Sector, Environmental Health, World Bank Industrial Development Capacity Project, Rotterdam Convention, Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), Stockholm Convention (Effective Evaluation and POPS Review Committee), Heavy Metals including Mercury
16.	Dr. Subodh Kumar Sharma, Adviser	T. No. 24360861 subodh.kumar@nic.in Intercom No. 112	National Communications (NATCOM) IPCC (Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change) & all other Scientific Technical works related to Climate Change
17.	Sh. R. S. Ahlawat Economic Adviser	T. No. 24362663 Intercom No. 908 rsahlawat-mef@nic.in	Policy matters of Economic Cell including PC Division
18.	Sh. Nil Kanth Ghosh Statistical Adviser	Intercom No. 906	Annual Report of the MoEF, 'State of Environment' Reports, Environmental Information (excluding Indira Gandhi Paryavaran Puraskar), Statistical Cell, NGO Cell
19.	Sh. Arvind M. Singh, DIGF (SU)	Vigyan Sadhan, R. K. Puram T. No. 26101178 arvindmsingh@ yahoo.com	Survey & Utilization, International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), Forestry Statistics
20.	Smt. Ranjana Gupta DIGF	T. No. 24360549 ranjanagupta2001 @yahoo.com Intercom No. 431	Forest Policy, NFAP, Forest International Cooperation (FIC) & National Forest Commission (NFC)
21.	Sh. Anmol Kumar, DIGF (WL)	aka6@indiatimes.com T. No. 24360740 Intercom No. 106	Wildlife, Wildlife Regional Offices, World Heritage Convention, National Zoological Park, Central Zoo Authority, National Board of Wildlife, matter relating to International Conservation Union, Convention on Migratory Species, UNESCO, Wildlife research/Consultancies, Wildlife, Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species (CITES), Project Elephant, National Parks & Sanctuaries -Bird flu (Avian Influenza) -Vulture conservation, -Awards & fellowships, etc. -World Bank & Food Agriculture -Organization (FAO) projects -Thematic Group on Conservation & -Management of Wild Life.
22.	Shri Ashok Pai, DIGF	T. No. 24362416 ashokepai@nic.in Intercom No. 705	NAEB, FDA/NAP (12 States), Policy matters related to Afforestation, 20 Point Programme, M&E, Communication & United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
23.	Shri A. R. Chadha, DIGF	T. No. 24364791 Intercom No. 108	Forestry Research and Training (RT), Asia-Pacific Forest Invasion Network (APFISN), International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR), Administrative and Financial matters of Indian Council Forestry Research and Education (ICFRE), Dehradun, Forest Survey of India (FSI), Dehradun, Indira Gandhi National Forest Academy (IGNFA), Dehradun, Directorate of Forest Education (DFE), Dehradun and all matters of Indian

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			Plywood Industries Research and Training Institute (IPRTI), Bangalore and Indian Institute of Forest Management (IIFM), Bhopal.
24.	Shri A. K. Johari, DIGF	T. No. 24362016 Intercom No. 102 johari60@yahoo.com	Forest Protection Division (FPD) & Joint Forest Management (JFM) Cell, LULUCF under United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Non-timber Forest Produce
25.	Dr. Rashid Hasan, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360734 hasan-mef@nic.in Intercom No. 740	CP Division, Vehicular Pollution
26.	Dr. M. Subba Rao, Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24361410 wowsubarao@yahoo. co.in Intercom No. 738	Biomedical Waste Management (Management & Handling) Rules Ship breaking matters. Supreme court case regarding management of hazardous waste pending since 1995. Supreme Court monitoring Committee on management of Hazardous Waste. Registration of recyclers of waste oil/used oil and nonferrous metallic wastes. Recycling of waste oil/used oil. Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) of International Maritime Organization (IMO) regarding International Convention on Safe and Environmentally Sound Ship Recycling. -Coordination of HSMD.
27.	Dr. E. V. Muley Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24364593 evmuley@nic.in Intercom No. 558	Botanical Survey of India (BSI), Zoological Survey of India (ZSI), Botanic Garden of Indian Republic (BGIR)
28.	Dr. S. Kaul Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360492 26178917(R) kaul52@yahoo.com Intercom No. 602	Wetlands under National Wetland Conservation Programme (NWCP) (in the states of Orissa, Kerala Karnataka, Jharkhand, AP, Bihar, MP, Maharashtra, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Meghalaya, T.N., Gujarat and UT of Chandigarh). Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology & Natural History (SACON). R & D relating to Wetlands, Budget matters related to NWCP, Payment of annual contribution to Ramsar Convention and Wetlands International
29.	Dr. Saroj Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24364067 sarojmoef@yahoo.com Intercom No. 751	HSMD Basel Convention Hazardous Waste (Management & Handling) Rules, Batteries (Management & Handling) Rules, Basel Convention on control of trans-boundary movement of hazardous waste Import Export of Hazardous Waste including DGFT matters. E-waste including task force on Ewaste
30.	Dr. (Mrs) Chanda Chaudhary Director (Scientific)	T. No. 24360662 chhanda-c@yahoo.com Intercom No. 741	Lead Acid Batteries (Management & Handling) Rules. Chemical Safety in Maximum Accident Hazard (MAH) Unit Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) National chemical management profile

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
31.	Shri S. Jagannathan Director	T. No. 24361613 kr063@ifs.nic.in Intercom No. 116	IFD (Environment)
32.	Shri Chandan Singh Director	T. No. 24360678 chandan.singh@nic.in Intercom No. 104	Forest Establishment (FE) Grievances Officer for employees of the MoEF.
33.	Shri S. K. Aggarwal Director	T. No. 24368442 24362206 satish.ka@nic.in Intercom No. 140	National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) Administration Co-ordination of IC & Training Budget, Annual Plan, Co-ordination of Parliamentary matters/ Committees, Committees of NRCA, Co-ordination work of NRCP/GAP including Parliament Questions, Matters of general nature requiring co-ordination, Co-ordination of YAP, Works of publicity, public participation
34.	Shri Vivek Saxena Director	T. No. 24362065 hr062@ifs.nic.in Intercom No. 135	ACR Cell of IFS Officers & Cadre Management of AGMUT Cadre.
35.	Sh. Anjani Kumar Director (AW)	T. No. 23318553 anjani.moef@yahoo.com anjani.srivastava@nic.in	Animal Welfare Division and updation/development of the MoEF's websites.
36.	Sh. A. K. Lal Director	T. No. 24367077 Intercom No. 503 aklal87@gmail.com	Cadre Management of Indian Forest Service (IFS), except AGMUT Cadre.
37.	Shri Suresh Prasad Choubey Director	T. No. 24361952 csp12@indiatimes.com Intercom No. 625	Hindi (Official language)
38.	Dr. M. A. Haque Director	T. No. 24360659 Intercom No. 616 haque@nic.in	Ecologically Sensitive Areas Fly ash social and economic issues on research
39.	Dr. R. K. Pathak Tech. Director	T. No. 24360465 Intercom No. 611 rkpathak@nic.in	National Informatics Centre
40.	Shri Ashwini Kumar Mishra Dy. Secretary	T. No. Intercom No. 917	Integrated Finance Division on Forests, NAEB & Wildlife
41.	Shri Alok Agarwal Dy. Secretary	alokagarwal63@nic.in Intercom No. 704	Administration (P. I, P. II & P. III), Public Grievance Cell
42.	Sh. Narain Dass Dy. Secretary	T. No. 24367631 Intercom No. 527 dass.narain@nic.in	General Co-ordination, GA, Protocol and Parliament.
43.	Shri V. K. Jayaswal Suptd Engineer (CCU)	T. No. 24360588 seccu-mef@nic.in Intercom No. 725	Matters concerning/pertaining to Planning and execution of the works of Ministry of Environment & Forests and its Departements, Subordinate Offices and Autonomous Institutions which are entrusted to Civil Construction Unit

III. All Officers in possession of information and dealing with the matters above will be defacto PIOs.

IV. The arrangement of designating Link Officers in the Ministry will also be applicable to the Appellate Authorities/ CPIOs for dealing with matters under the RTI Act.

V. This supersedes the earlier notification No. 1/2/2007-RC dated 17th July, 2009 of this Ministry.

VI. Hindi version follows.

[No. 1/1/2009-RC]

A. K. GOYAL, Jt. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010			843	00	03	56
का. आ. 162. —केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि पारादीप (उड़ीसा) से रायपुर (छत्तीसगढ़) एवं राँची (झारखण्ड) तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिये इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "पारादीप-नया सम्बलपुर-रायपुर-राँची पाइपलाइन" बिछाई जानी चाहिए;			842	00	00	29
			858	00	00	32
			861	00	04	12
			862	00	00	96
			860	00	04	09
			868	00	00	55
			867	00	05	93
			866	00	01	57
			870	00	03	39
			871	00	02	35
			646	00	03	67
			645	00	00	99
			644	00	08	86
			651	00	01	76
			642	00	07	57
अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;			641	00	04	05
कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में श्री सुकान्त कुमार प्रधान, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, पारादीप -नया सम्बलपुर-रायपुर-राँची पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 1295, फॉरेस्ट पार्क, भुवनेश्वर- 751009 (उड़ीसा) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।			638	00	02	49
			632	00	06	25
			635	00	05	57
			634	00	01	24
			421	00	05	92
			636	00	00	19
			422	00	01	22
			423	00	01	06
			424	00	06	15
			1100	00	00	10
			427	00	02	33
			425	00	00	25
			426	00	01	10
			419	00	01	90
			418	00	01	12
अनुसूची			430	00	01	76
तहसील-ओडपडा	जिला -ढेन्कनाल	राज्य-उड़ीसा				
गाँव का नाम	प्लॉट नं.	क्षेत्रफल				
		हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
कोरेहिगाडिआ	1048	00	04	97		
	832	00	04	34	1065	00 14 34
	1046	00	00	31	145	00 05 78
	833	00	00	90	146	00 00 40
	831	00	05	94	144	00 03 41
	830	00	01	63	143	00 01 00
	835	00	00	56	142	00 02 53
	836	00	02	60	138	00 11 55
	846	00	03	52	134	00 00 91
	844	00	05	87	133	00 04 37
					1049	00 03 05

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पालसुघा	385	00	02	95	पालसुघा	179	00	00	20
	441	00	00	10		168	00	00	22
	337	00	00	10		178	00	03	76
	336	00	05	33		177	00	02	54
	335	00	03	38		182	00	02	09
	442	00	02	93		397	00	01	73
	316	00	01	27		175	00	00	10
	393	00	00	22		183	00	00	92
	314	00	00	10		184	00	08	92
	306	00	02	45	इन्दिपुर	4331	00	02	43
	307	00	04	30		2515	00	00	20
	312	00	00	42		4332	00	04	80
	308	00	13	69		2407	00	02	52
	310	00	00	10		2405	00	01	32
	309	00	03	72		4328	00	02	00
	251	00	01	88		2512	00	00	10
	246	00	00	10		2419	00	02	35
	250	00	01	64		2420	00	00	10
	252	00	00	46		2418	00	13	55
	249	00	00	16		2421	00	12	05
	253	00	11	34		2422	00	00	10
	260	00	00	10		2426	00	01	53
	254	00	03	87		2427	00	02	00
	258	00	00	82		2439	00	04	35
	392	00	01	20		2434	00	02	43
	256	00	02	28		2433	00	01	45
	204	00	03	09		4447	00	03	21
	209	00	00	10		2463	00	04	86
	205	00	02	84		2435	00	03	61
	206	00	00	54		2462	00	00	10
	202	00	00	96		2442	00	05	42
	207	00	03	15		2441	00	07	36
	199	00	00	39		2377	00	01	87
	201	00	03	68		1153	00	01	48
	160	00	00	13		1154	00	02	36
	200	00	02	05		4236	00	02	06
	163	00	02	31		1155	00	03	34
	192	00	00	20		1160	00	07	44
	164	00	02	59		1161	00	00	40
	162	00	00	10		1159	00	03	78
	166	00	00	87		1175	00	06	21
	165	00	00	76		4047	00	06	36
	167	00	01	21		1217	00	01	48

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
इन्दिपुर	1218	00	06	84	इन्दिपुर	120	00	00	26
	1219	00	00	40		126	00	00	60
	4302	00	00	60		119	00	06	17
	4301	00	00	10		135	00	00	40
	1220	00	06	00		121	00	00	10
	1221	00	02	42		4417	00	00	55
	1222	00	01	37		118	00	03	20
	1224	00	07	63		4429	00	00	72
	4205	00	01	12		4209	00	02	54
	1231	00	00	21		137	00	00	75
	1223	00	01	86		84	00	04	87
	1232	00	02	79		83	00	02	12
	1236	00	00	19		82	00	05	71
	1235	00	04	92		22	00	00	45
	1234	00	00	24		24	00	04	25
	1266	00	00	38		23	00	00	10
	1265	00	04	55		74	00	03	90
	4435	00	02	02		25	00	04	48
	1268	00	04	51		34	00	02	31
	1267	00	00	10		33	00	00	50
	1269	00	00	30		35	00	03	63
	1284	00	00	80		39	00	01	03
	1270	00	00	25		36	00	01	01
	1283	00	02	40		38	00	09	34
	1285	00	00	95		37	00	00	10
	1282	00	02	12		12	00	14	73
	1286	00	04	21		13	00	00	20
	1330	00	00	48	नुणि	82	00	00	53
	1331	00	03	46		81	00	00	10
	1329	00	05	27		83	00	05	15
	1328	00	00	52		86	00	00	94
	1336	00	03	70		85	00	02	59
	1340	00	00	10		84	00	01	41
	1339	00	05	25		92	00	03	77
	1338	00	00	94		93	00	01	11
	1386	00	02	39		100	00	01	37
	124	00	00	75		96	00	00	44
	1387	00	02	02		99	00	01	72
	1367	00	00	46		97	00	00	10
	125	00	00	47		98	00	02	09
	4233	00	00	10		109	00	01	66
	123	00	01	61		108	00	00	87
	122	00	00	20		110	00	00	79

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
नुणि (जारी)	111	00	00	10	नुणि (जारी)	216	00	01	89
	107	00	01	97		217	00	02	08
	112	00	05	77		213	00	00	98
	113	00	01	71		206	00	00	10
	116	00	00	10		207	00	01	69
	114	00	01	11		208	00	02	28
	115	00	01	80		212	00	01	43
	133	00	00	10		211	00	02	02
	132	00	04	15		209	00	00	41
	131	00	02	42		210	00	01	62
	129	00	00	10		220	00	00	82
	130	00	00	70	डंगबोरेइ	1473	00	00	10
	134	00	00	10		1472	00	02	93
	135	00	05	17		1469	00	02	33
	125	00	00	66		1468	00	00	32
	139	00	01	13		1471	00	00	56
	138	00	00	79		1470	00	02	02
	140	00	02	06		1467	00	02	01
	141	00	00	10		1461	00	03	73
	148	00	02	92	बेडा	1460	00	00	10
	142	00	01	21		328	00	05	45
	144	00	02	53		327	00	02	99
	1121	00	01	49		321	00	01	17
	146	00	00	39		727	00	02	40
	145	00	02	77		325	00	01	82
	155	00	03	89		728	00	00	14
	157	00	01	85		324	00	00	84
	156	00	01	48		294	00	05	19
	167	00	00	17		333	00	01	11
	168	00	02	02		289	00	01	63
	1131	00	00	48		293	00	01	25
	164	00	00	48		290	00	01	17
	252	00	00	41		291	00	01	20
	169	00	02	02		292	00	00	33
	170	00	02	31		283	00	01	32
	250	00	02	58		284	00	02	87
	171	00	01	59		285	00	01	99
	249	00	02	02		387	00	00	71
	248	00	00	10		385	00	01	23
	247	00	00	14		388	00	00	46
	187	00	00	83		389	00	01	33
	185	00	01	33		391	00	01	76
	186	00	01	62		393	00	00	10
	188	00	00	19		392	00	01	79
	192	00	02	31		399	00	02	02
	191	00	00	31		400	00	01	21
						401	00	00	21
						402	00	02	78
						421	00	01	87

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बेडा (जारी)	422	00	01	16	काण्डबिन्धा (जारा)	1838	00	08	37
	423	00	02	00		1834	00	00	42
	424	00	00	29		1836	00	08	09
	461	00	00	10		5338	00	00	10
	460	00	03	02		5337	00	03	78
	459	00	01	70		5339	00	00	19
	463	00	00	84		1874	00	01	55
	458	00	01	10		1875	00	02	63
	464	00	01	17		1879	00	05	41
	478	00	00	93		1881	00	00	80
	477	00	00	34		1882	00	04	80
	479	00	06	53		1883	00	03	55
	574	00	00	91		5728	00	00	82
	480	00	03	26		5729	00	03	89
	573	00	01	94		5312	00	00	61
	572	00	02	50		1955	00	03	76
	486	00	00	10		1961	00	00	18
	485	00	01	18		1954	00	03	33
	484	00	10	12		1949	00	00	88
	487	00	00	66		1953	00	01	90
	489	00	00	22		1950	00	02	34
	490	00	05	96		1948	00	00	10
	491	00	00	55		1952	00	03	47
	496	00	02	91		1951	00	03	65
	495	00	00	53		1965	00	00	67
	494	00	02	13		5678	00	02	22
	493	00	00	20		1931	00	00	86
	530	00	02	59		2517	00	04	29
	529	00	01	91		2518	00	01	64
	528	00	02	80		2519	00	00	62
	527	00	02	51		2520	00	01	08
	526	00	00	24		2522	00	06	36
	525	00	10	50		2523	00	00	21
	524	00	07	88		2498	00	00	71
	539	00	00	16		2496	00	03	23
	523	00	08	51		2497	00	02	10
काण्डबिन्धा	1822	00	03	56		2486	00	00	10
	1826	00	03	68		2487	00	00	86
	1825	00	01	45		2495	00	00	52
	1827	00	02	73		2488	00	02	77
	1824	00	00	84		2494	00	00	13
	1829	00	02	42		2489	00	01	10
	1841	00	02	42		2490	00	01	62
	1842	00	02	24		2492	00	00	10
	1843	00	03	48		5786	00	00	20
	1840	00	00	17		2491	00	00	71
	1844	00	00	24		2469	00	00	46
	1839	00	01	77		2468	00	03	21
	1837	00	01	30					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
काण्डबिन्धा (जारी)	2447	00	01	19
	2467	00	01	21
	2466	00	02	10
	2534	00	03	14
	2663	00	00	66
	2464	00	02	42
	2465	00	01	21
	2721	00	00	58
	2722	00	00	40
	2723	00	00	20
	2463	00	00	48
	2724	00	04	23
	2228	00	01	43
	2727	00	01	98
	2726	00	00	90
	2729	00	03	83
	2730	00	01	03
	2731	00	02	37
	2710	00	00	72
	2709	00	02	57
	2732	00	00	90
	2734	00	00	28
	2745	00	02	08
	2749	00	01	01
	2750	00	00	42
	2762	00	00	34
	2748	00	00	16
	2801	00	02	58
	2800	00	02	31
	2802	00	00	23
	2799	00	02	75
	2798	00	01	08
	2796	00	01	12
	2784	00	00	10
	2797	00	00	28
	2795	00	01	62
	2811	00	00	61
	2794	00	01	62
	2793	00	01	10
	2812	00	00	10
	2818	00	12	45
	2828	00	04	07
	2829	00	00	88
	2833	00	05	43
	2836	00	00	51
	2835	00	00	50
	5548	00	01	26
	2834	00	05	22
	2855	00	01	29
	5722	00	02	13

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
काण्डबिन्धा (जारी)	5721	00	01	31
	5723	00	00	59
	2846	00	02	50
	2845	00	01	38
	2842	00	00	64
	2843	00	05	06
	2844	00	02	41
	3294	00	01	21
	3295	00	08	06
	3296	00	03	92
	3538	00	01	65
	5357	00	02	45
	3549	00	00	10
	3548	00	04	17
	5356	00	00	59
	3539	00	06	51
	3540	00	00	52
	5550	00	01	18
	5551	00	01	62
	3512	00	01	66
	5552	00	02	03
	3510	00	01	00
	3513	00	00	10
	3509	00	03	81
	3508	00	15	89
	3504	00	00	46
	3505	00	02	99
	3507	00	05	82
	3497	00	01	76
	3551	00	08	53
	3588	00	00	18
	5997	00	00	94
	3593	00	01	60
	3594	00	01	41
	3595	00	02	01
	3604	00	02	21
	3603	00	00	70
	3605	00	02	36
	3602	00	00	10
	3606	00	03	40
	3607	00	01	65
	3608	00	01	04
	3669	00	01	20
	3656	00	00	81
	3609	00	00	10
	3610	00	01	31
	3657	00	00	48
	3658	00	00	22
	3655	00	03	23
	3611	00	00	37

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
काण्डबिन्धा (जारी)	3613	00	00	10	काण्डबिन्धा (जारी)	4233	00	00	20
	3612	00	01	04		4231	00	01	43
	3621	00	00	22		4227	00	08	13
	3654	00	03	64		4230	00	03	58
	3622	00	03	96		4229	00	06	56
	3624	00	00	48		4228	00	00	65
	3623	00	03	58		4240	00	11	07
	3642	00	00	10		4245	00	04	15
	3643	00	09	75		4246	00	08	86
	3647	00	01	69		4247	00	02	09
	3644	00	00	42		4263	00	00	35
	3645	00	01	62		4254	00	06	00
	3646	00	01	09		4248	00	02	74
	3745	00	07	43		4250	00	02	09
	3746	00	00	63		4251	00	02	26
	3744	00	02	86		4252	00	08	49
	5238	00	00	57		4253	00	01	18
	5237	00	03	85	बलरामपुर	2882	00	03	40
	3728	00	01	49		2811	00	12	61
	3742	00	00	66		2812	00	15	08
	6029	00	02	79		2813	00	09	03
	3727	00	00	72		2862	00	03	47
	3725	00	00	23		2863	00	06	80
	3790	00	03	68		2861	00	09	82
	3791	00	03	56		2865	00	00	78
	3722	00	07	03		2866	00	05	25
	5605	00	04	53		2857	00	00	62
	5604	00	05	86		2868	00	39	06
	3799	00	01	11		2870	00	13	54
	5608	00	02	74		2878	00	02	27
	5603	00	00	10		2877	00	07	16
	5609	00	00	62		2876	00	07	03
	3838	00	02	03		2875	00	09	15
	3563	00	00	20		2874	00	08	20
	3858	00	20	76		2873	00	09	00
	3847	00	00	13		2872	00	05	27
	3846	00	50	97		2880	00	20	21
	4196	00	00	10		2904	00	05	41
	4197	00	12	34		2905	00	05	28
	4200	00	06	34		2909	00	35	68
	4199	00	01	47		2910	00	03	37
	4198	00	06	08		2911	00	01	55
	4181	00	01	63		2912	00	15	96
	4210	00	08	79		2937	00	26	70
	4211	00	14	31		2934	00	13	13
	4212	00	08	26		2932	00	06	32
	4235	00	08	50					
	4234	00	02	27					
	4232	00	01	45					

[सं. आर-25011/24/2009 ओ.आर. 1]

बी. के. दत्त अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S. O. 162.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the Public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Paradip (Orissa) to Raipur (Chhattisgarh) & Ranchi (Jharkhand), "Paradip - New Sambalpur - Raipur Ranchi Pipeline" should be laid by Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Sri Sukanta Kumar Pradhan, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Paradip - New Sambalpur - Raipur - Ranchi Pipeline Project, 1295, Forest Park, Bhubaneswar-751 009, (Orissa).

SCHEDULE

Tehsil: ODAPADA District: DHENKANAL State: ORISSA

Name of the Village	Plot No.	Area		
		Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5
Korehigadia	1048	00	04	97
	832	00	04	34
	1046	00	00	31
	833	00	00	90
	831	00	05	94
	830	00	01	63
	835	00	00	56
	836	00	02	60
	846	00	03	52
	844	00	05	87
	843	00	03	56
	842	00	00	29
	858	00	00	32
	861	00	04	12
	862	00	00	96
	860	00	04	09
	868	00	00	55
	867	00	05	93
	866	00	01	57
	870	00	03	39

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Korehigadia—Contd.	871	00	02	35
	646	00	03	67
	645	00	00	99
	644	00	08	86
	651	00	01	76
	642	00	07	57
	641	00	04	05
	638	00	02	49
	632	00	06	25
	635	00	05	57
	634	00	01	24
	421	00	05	92
	636	00	00	19
	422	00	01	22
	423	00	01	06
	424	00	06	15
	1100	00	00	10
	427	00	02	33
	425	00	00	25
	426	00	01	10
Palasudha	419	00	01	90
	418	00	01	12
	430	00	01	76
	1065	00	14	34
	145	00	05	78
	146	00	00	40
	144	00	03	41
	143	00	01	00
	142	00	02	53
	138	00	11	55
	134	00	00	91
	133	00	04	37
	1049	00	03	05
	385	00	02	95
	441	00	00	10
	337	00	00	10
	336	00	05	33
	335	00	03	38
	442	00	02	93
	316	00	01	27
	393	00	00	22
	314	00	00	10
	306	00	02	45
	307	00	04	30
	312	00	00	42
	308	00	13	69
	310	00	00	10
	309	00	03	72
	251	00	01	88

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Palasudha—Contd.	246	00	00	10	INDIPUR—Contd	2425	00	01	53
	250	00	01	64		2427	00	02	00
	252	00	00	46		2439	00	04	35
	249	00	00	16		2434	00	02	43
	253	00	11	34		2433	00	01	45
	260	00	00	10		4447	00	03	21
	254	00	03	87		2463	00	04	86
	258	00	00	82		2435	00	03	61
	392	00	01	20		2462	00	00	10
	256	00	02	28		2442	00	05	42
	204	00	03	09		2441	00	07	36
	209	00	00	10		2377	00	01	87
	205	00	02	84		1153	00	01	48
	206	00	00	54		1154	00	02	36
	202	00	00	96		4236	00	02	06
	207	00	03	15		1155	00	03	34
	199	00	00	39		1160	00	07	44
	201	00	03	68		1161	00	00	40
	160	00	00	13		1159	00	03	78
	200	00	02	05		1175	00	06	21
	163	00	02	31		4047	00	06	36
	192	00	00	20		1217	00	01	48
	164	00	02	59		1218	00	06	84
	162	00	00	10		1219	00	00	40
	166	00	00	87		4302	00	00	60
	165	00	00	76		4301	00	00	10
	167	00	01	21		1220	00	06	00
	179	00	00	20		1221	00	02	42
	168	00	00	22		1222	00	01	37
	178	00	03	76		1224	00	07	63
	177	00	02	54		4205	00	01	12
	182	00	02	09		1231	00	00	21
	397	00	01	73		1223	00	01	86
	175	00	00	10		1232	00	02	79
	183	00	00	92		1236	00	00	19
	184	00	08	92		1235	00	04	92
INDIPUR	4331	00	02	43		1234	00	00	24
	2515	00	00	20		1266	00	00	38
	4332	00	04	80		1265	00	04	55
	2407	00	02	52		4435	00	02	02
	2405	00	01	32		1268	00	04	51
	4328	00	02	00		1267	00	00	10
	2512	00	00	10		1269	00	00	30
	2419	00	02	35		1284	00	00	80
	2420	00	00	10		1270	00	00	25
	2418	00	13	55		1283	00	02	40
	2421	00	12	05		1285	00	00	95
	2422	00	00	10		1282	00	02	12

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
INDIPUR— <i>Contd.</i>	1286	00	04	21	NUNI	82	00	00	53
	1330	00	00	48		81	00	00	10
	1331	00	03	46		83	00	05	15
	1329	00	05	27		86	00	00	94
	1328	00	00	52		85	00	02	59
	1336	00	03	70		84	00	01	41
	1340	00	00	10		92	00	03	77
	1339	00	05	25		93	00	01	11
	1338	00	00	94		100	00	01	37
	1386	00	02	39		96	00	00	44
	124	00	00	75		99	00	01	72
	1387	00	02	02		97	00	00	10
	1367	00	00	46		98	00	02	09
	125	00	00	47		109	00	01	66
	4233	00	00	10		108	00	00	87
	123	00	01	61		110	00	00	79
	122	00	00	20		111	00	00	10
	120	00	00	26		107	00	01	97
	126	00	00	60		112	00	05	77
	119	00	06	17		113	00	01	71
	135	00	00	40		116	00	00	10
	121	00	00	10		114	00	01	11
	4417	00	00	55		115	00	01	80
	118	00	03	20		133	00	00	10
	4429	00	00	72		132	00	04	15
	4209	00	02	54		131	00	02	42
	137	00	00	75		129	00	00	10
	84	00	04	87		130	00	00	70
	83	00	02	12		134	00	00	10
	82	00	05	71		135	00	05	17
	22	00	00	43		125	00	00	66
	24	00	04	25		139	00	01	13
	23	00	00	10		138	00	00	79
	74	00	03	90		140	00	02	06
	25	00	04	48		141	00	00	10
	34	00	02	31		148	00	02	92
	33	00	00	50		142	00	01	21
	35	00	03	63		144	00	02	53
	39	00	01	03		1121	00	01	49
	36	00	01	01		146	00	00	39
	38	00	09	34		145	00	02	77
	37	00	00	10		155	00	03	89
	12	00	14	73		157	00	01	85
	13	00	00	20		156	00	01	48

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NUNI—Contd.	167	00	00	17	BEDA—Contd.	324	00	00	84
	168	00	02	02		294	00	05	19
	1131	00	00	48		333	00	01	11
	164	00	00	48		289	00	01	63
	252	00	00	41		293	00	01	25
	169	00	02	02		290	00	01	17
	170	00	02	31		291	00	01	20
	250	00	02	58		292	00	00	33
	171	00	01	59		283	00	01	32
	249	00	02	02		284	00	02	87
	248	00	00	10		285	00	01	99
	247	00	00	14		387	00	00	71
	187	00	00	83		385	00	01	23
	185	00	01	33		388	00	00	46
	186	00	01	62		389	00	01	33
	188	00	00	19		391	00	01	76
	192	00	02	31		393	00	00	10
	191	00	00	31		392	00	01	79
	216	00	01	89		399	00	02	02
	217	00	02	08		400	00	01	21
	213	00	00	98		401	00	00	21
	206	00	00	10		402	00	02	78
	207	00	01	69		421	00	01	87
	208	00	02	28		422	00	01	16
	212	00	01	43		423	00	02	00
	211	00	02	02		424	00	00	29
	209	00	00	41		461	00	00	10
	210	00	01	62		460	00	03	02
	220	00	00	82		459	00	01	70
DENGABORI	1473	00	00	10		463	00	00	84
	1472	00	02	93		458	00	01	10
	1469	00	02	33		464	00	01	17
	1468	00	00	32		478	00	00	93
	1471	00	00	56		477	00	00	34
	1470	00	02	02		479	00	06	53
	1467	00	02	01		574	00	00	91
	1461	00	03	73		480	00	03	26
	1460	00	00	10		573	00	01	94
BEDA	328	00	05	45		572	00	02	50
	327	00	02	99		486	00	00	10
	321	00	01	17		485	00	01	18
	727	00	02	40		484	00	10	12
	325	00	01	82		487	00	00	66
	728	00	00	14		489	00	00	22

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Beda—Contd.	490	00	05	96	Kandabindha (Contd.)	1961	00	00	18
	491	00	00	55		1954	00	03	33
	496	00	02	91		1949	00	00	88
	495	00	00	53		1953	00	01	90
	494	00	02	13		1950	00	02	34
	493	00	00	20		1948	00	00	10
	530	00	02	59		1952	00	03	47
	529	00	01	91		1951	00	03	65
	528	00	02	80		1965	00	00	67
	527	00	02	51		5678	00	02	22
	526	00	00	24		1931	00	00	86
	525	00	10	50		2517	00	04	29
	524	00	07	88		2518	00	01	64
	539	00	00	16		2519	00	00	62
	523	00	08	51		2520	00	01	08
Kandabindha	1822	00	03	56		2522	00	06	36
	1826	00	03	68		2523	00	00	21
	1825	00	01	45		2498	00	00	71
	1827	00	02	73		2496	00	03	23
	1824	00	00	84		2497	00	02	10
	1829	00	02	42		2486	00	00	10
	1841	00	02	42		2487	00	00	86
Kandabindha (Contd.)	1842	00	02	24		2495	00	00	52
	1843	00	03	48		2488	00	02	77
	1840	00	00	17		2494	00	00	13
	1844	00	00	24		2489	00	01	10
	1839	00	01	77		2490	00	01	62
	1837	00	01	30		2492	00	00	10
	1838	00	08	37		5786	00	00	20
	1834	00	00	42		2491	00	00	71
	1836	00	08	09		2469	00	00	46
	5338	00	00	10		2468	00	03	21
	5337	00	03	78		2447	00	01	19
	5339	00	00	19		2467	00	01	21
	1874	00	01	55		2466	00	02	10
	1875	00	02	63		2534	00	03	14
	1879	00	05	41		2663	00	00	66
	1881	00	00	80		2464	00	02	42
	1882	00	04	80		2465	00	01	21
	1883	00	03	55		2721	00	00	58
	5728	00	00	82		2722	00	00	40
	5729	00	03	89		2723	00	00	20
	5312	00	00	61		2463	00	00	48
	1955	00	03	76		2724	00	04	23

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kandabindha (Contd.)	2228	00	01	43	Kandabindha (Contd.)	2844	00	02	41
	2727	00	01	98		3294	00	01	21
	2726	00	00	90		3295	00	08	06
	2729	00	03	83		3296	00	03	92
	2730	00	01	03		3538	00	01	65
	2731	00	02	37		5357	00	02	45
	2710	00	00	72		3549	00	00	10
	2709	00	02	57		3548	00	04	17
	2732	00	00	90		5356	00	00	59
	2734	00	00	28		3539	00	06	51
	2745	00	02	08		3540	00	00	52
	2749	00	01	01		5550	00	01	18
	2750	00	00	42		5551	00	01	62
	2762	00	00	34		3512	00	01	66
	2748	00	00	16		5552	00	02	03
	2801	00	02	58		3510	00	01	00
	2800	00	02	31		3513	00	00	10
	2802	00	00	23		3509	00	03	81
	2799	00	02	75		3508	00	15	89
	2798	00	01	08		3504	00	00	46
	2796	00	01	12		3505	00	02	99
	2784	00	00	10		3507	00	05	82
	2797	00	00	28		3497	00	01	76
	2795	00	01	62		3551	00	08	53
	2811	00	00	61		3588	00	00	18
	2794	00	01	62		5997	00	00	94
	2793	00	01	10		3593	00	01	60
	2812	00	00	10		3594	00	01	41
	2818	00	12	45		3595	00	02	01
	2828	00	04	07		3604	00	02	21
	2829	00	00	88		3603	00	00	70
	2833	00	05	43		3605	00	02	36
	2836	00	00	51		3602	00	00	10
	2835	00	00	50		3606	00	03	40
	5548	00	01	26		3607	00	01	65
	2834	00	05	22		3608	00	01	04
	2855	00	01	29		3669	00	01	20
	5722	00	02	13		3656	00	00	81
	5721	00	01	31		3609	00	00	10
	5723	00	00	59		3610	00	01	31
	2846	00	02	50		3657	00	00	48
	2845	00	01	38		3658	00	00	22
	2842	00	00	64		3655	00	03	23
	2843	00	05	06		3611	00	00	37

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kandabindha (Contd.)	3613	00	00	10
	3612	00	01	04
	3621	00	00	22
	3654	00	03	64
	3622	00	03	96
	3624	00	00	48
	3623	00	03	58
	3642	00	00	10
	3643	00	09	75
	3647	00	01	69
	3644	00	00	42
	3645	00	01	62
	3646	00	01	09
	3745	00	07	43
	3746	00	00	63
	3744	00	02	86
	5238	00	00	57
	5237	00	03	85
	3728	00	01	49
	3742	00	00	66
	6029	00	02	79
	3727	00	00	72
	3725	00	00	23
	3790	00	03	68
	3791	00	03	56
	3722	00	07	03
	5605	00	04	53
	5604	00	05	86
	3799	00	01	11
	5608	00	02	74
	5603	00	00	10
	5609	00	00	62
	3838	00	02	03
	3563	00	00	20
	3858	00	20	76
	3847	00	00	13
	3846	00	50	97
	4196	00	00	10
	4197	00	12	34
	4200	00	06	34
	4199	00	01	47
	4198	00	06	08
	4181	00	01	63
	4210	00	08	79
	4211	00	14	31
	4212	00	08	26
	4235	00	08	50
	4234	00	02	27

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kandabindha (Contd.)	4232	00	01	45
	4233	00	00	20
	4231	00	01	43
	4227	00	08	13
	4230	00	03	58
	4229	00	06	56
	4228	00	00	65
	4240	00	11	07
	4245	00	04	15
	4246	00	08	86
	4247	00	02	09
	4263	00	00	35
	4254	00	06	00
	4248	00	02	74
	4250	00	02	09
	4251	00	02	26
	4252	00	08	49
	4253	00	01	18
Balarampur	2882	00	03	40
	2811	00	12	61
	2812	00	15	08
	2813	00	09	05
	2862	00	03	47
	2863	00	06	80
	2861	00	09	82
	2865	00	00	78
	2866	00	05	25
	2857	00	00	62
	2868	00	39	06
	2870	00	13	54
	2878	00	02	27
	2877	00	07	16
	2876	00	07	03
	2875	00	09	15
	2874	00	08	20
	2873	00	09	00
	2872	00	05	27
	2880	00	20	21
	2904	00	05	41
	2905	00	04	28
	2909	00	35	68
	2910	00	03	37
	2911	00	01	55
	2912	00	15	96
	2937	00	26	70
	2934	00	13	13
	2932	00	06	32

[No. R-25011/24/2009-OR-I]

B. K. DATTA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 163.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि पारादीप (उड़ीसा) से रायपुर (छत्तीसगढ़) एवं राँची (झारखण्ड) तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिये इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा “पारादीप-नया सम्बलपुर-रायपुर-राँची पाइपलाइन” बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी भूमि, जिसके नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में श्री सुकान्त कुमार प्रधान, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, पारादीप -नया सम्बलपुर-रायपुर-राँची पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 1295, फॉरेस्ट पार्क, भुवनेश्वर- 751009 (उड़ीसा) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील-डेन्कानाल	जिला-डेन्कानाल	राज्य-उड़ीसा		
गाँव का नाम	प्लॉट नं.	क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
देपडा	1237	00	02	95
	1191	00	02	20
	1190	00	00	17
	1188	00	07	45
	1187	00	02	54
	1186	00	02	88
	1185	00	00	14
	1183	00	00	15
	1184	00	07	78
	1212	00	04	04
	1178	00	02	62
	1177	00	01	31
	1176	00	06	36

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
देपडा	1173	00	00	23
	1138	00	04	77
	1115	00	08	30
	1114	00	12	45
	1113	00	02	97
	1124	00	00	24
	1126	00	00	10
	1112	00	09	64
	1093	00	04	38
	1094	00	08	11
	1095	00	00	75
	1101	00	02	38
	1096	00	07	58
	1097	00	01	35
	1098	00	00	82
	1099	00	00	17
	1088	00	04	37
माणिपुर	2591	00	15	77
	2590	00	04	36
	1903	00	07	39
	2706	00	05	05
	2586	00	07	32
	1910	00	02	07
	2707	00	02	35
	2585	00	00	10
	1912	00	17	92
	1926	00	02	18
	2797	00	03	56
	1925	00	08	22
	1927	00	00	10
	1924	00	02	45
	1935	00	05	83
	1936	00	06	00
	1937	00	04	19
	1941	00	00	84
	1940	00	02	66
	1939	00	03	32
	1942	00	01	33
	1734	00	02	53
	1735	00	01	51
	1733	00	06	11
	1731	00	04	17
	2721	00	01	23

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मणिपुर (जारी)	1730	00	03	27	मणिपुर (जारी)	1150	00	05	64
	1729	00	03	48		1149	00	00	21
	1741	00	00	31		1144	00	05	81
	1727	00	00	10		1166	00	00	20
	1742	00	11	15		1143	00	01	65
	1744	00	03	86		1142	00	04	20
	1745	00	00	10		1141	00	01	52
	1743	00	02	01		1140	00	00	10
	1675	00	13	04		2807	00	04	82
	1677	00	00	10		1134	00	02	14
	1676	00	01	72		1126	00	05	15
	1680	00	04	28		1132	00	02	85
	1673	00	04	94		1131	00	00	20
	1672	00	07	64		1128	00	00	20
	1683	00	00	10		1127	00	03	21
	2826	00	04	31		1121	00	06	06
	1505	00	04	78		2726	00	00	20
	1492	00	08	25		2672	00	04	42
	1504	00	00	10		1009	00	09	13
	1503	00	07	74		1008	00	03	21
	1502	00	04	96		1007	00	16	67
	1501	00	03	35		982	00	01	89
	1511	00	00	85		981	00	14	13
	1510	00	05	32		975	00	04	54
	1512	00	00	65		976	00	05	66
	1513	00	04	11		977	00	00	30
	1514	00	08	63		974	00	16	29
	1516	00	00	90		918	00	05	22
	1515	00	07	26		920	00	00	20
	1517	00	03	61		919	00	00	80
	1543	00	02	48		916	00	05	62
	1385	00	00	10		2875	00	05	66
	1384	00	06	88		2874	00	02	68
	1383	00	02	11		915	00	05	35
	1382	00	00	10	पातराभाग	2734	00	02	99
	1372	00	00	42		2733	00	09	78
	1373	00	00	10		2732	00	05	09
	1381	00	03	44		3020	00	01	57
	1377	00	01	75		3022	00	04	76
	1376	00	02	02		2740	00	03	01
	1152	00	02	58		2741	00	00	10
	1156	00	00	10		2704	00	03	89
	1154	00	02	23		2743	00	00	10
	1153	00	04	05		2703	00	05	04
	1155	00	00	26					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पातर भाग (जारी)	2702	00	11	70	पातराभाग (जारी)	1986	00	03	75
	2700	00	04	64		1915	00	00	20
	2699	00	00	10		1916	00	03	10
	2698	00	06	94		1985	00	11	62
	2696	00	04	81		1917	00	02	91
	2692	00	08	27		1921	00	01	37
	2691	00	13	45		1919	00	03	53
	2685	00	01	76		1920	00	02	52
	2634	00	00	75		1908	00	14	68
	2635	00	02	74		1881	00	02	87
	2637	00	00	50		1882	00	06	02
	2636	00	02	23		1880	00	06	44
	2625	00	00	10		1883	00	11	06
	2624	00	01	97		1876	00	13	12
	2638	00	00	11		1875	00	24	85
	2622	00	05	51		1843	00	06	01
	2623	00	03	47		1842	00	04	49
	2621	00	00	10		1841	00	03	12
	2650	00	01	53		1844	00	04	80
	2649	00	02	67		1839	00	02	09
	2651	00	00	12		1840	00	01	28
	2662	00	01	59		2837	00	00	25
	2648	00	02	00		1768	00	00	36
	2663	00	01	55		1760	00	08	59
	2664	00	04	13		1766	00	04	12
	2665	00	03	35		1765	00	03	11
	2660	00	00	39		1633	00	00	46
	2807	00	03	45		1764	00	03	26
	2666	00	00	10		1763	00	01	20
	2659	00	09	41		1636	00	06	34
	2658	00	02	02		1637	00	06	17
	2506	00	13	03		1638	00	06	27
	2505	00	01	04		1639	00	01	40
	2502	00	07	41		1640	00	05	05
	2501	00	06	93		1642	00	00	10
	2500	00	00	34		1641	00	01	02
	2499	00	10	08		1647	00	02	87
	2496	00	02	24		1646	00	01	13
	2491	00	03	31		1645	00	03	00
	2495	00	04	70		1644	00	00	33
	2492	00	02	20		2885	00	01	82
	2493	00	06	15		1658	00	03	68
	2484	00	14	77		1660	00	00	33
	2482	00	00	13		1659	00	03	76
	1998	00	02	85		2818	00	00	92
	1914	00	02	28					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पातराभाग (जारी)	2817	00	00	74	पातराभाग (जारी)	2903	00	02	61
	1614	00	01	72		1236	00	01	01
	1661	00	01	76		2910	00	05	72
	1601	00	01	30		1219	00	02	27
	1602	00	01	10		1221	00	03	43
	1600	00	09	61		1222	00	04	60
	1599	00	00	95		1196	00	00	15
	1585	00	01	53		1192	00	01	20
	1584	00	08	00		1193	00	01	40
	1583	00	00	62		1195	00	02	47
	1564	00	00	29		1190	00	00	10
	1582	00	00	16		1194	00	06	58
	2902	00	06	71		1186	00	03	87
	1588	00	04	48		1200	00	01	94
	1589	00	00	31		1201	00	00	10
	1565	00	00	52		1184	00	03	23
	1566	00	00	15		1185	00	03	20
	1567	00	00	10		1183	00	00	10
	1570	00	08	64		1164	00	00	79
	1569	00	01	20		1162	00	01	45
	1568	00	04	60		1161	00	06	36
	1558	00	00	95		2858	00	00	10
	1557	00	00	10		2892	00	02	40
	1550	00	00	99		2891	00	01	87
	1551	00	10	81		1160	00	01	05
	1528	00	00	60		2890	00	03	40
	1522	00	06	65		1151	00	08	39
	1523	00	06	40		1316	00	02	78
	1524	00	05	68		2866	00	03	48
	1525	00	06	31		1148	00	00	10
	1282	00	06	76		1147	00	05	68
	1283	00	05	84		2889	00	01	70
	1298	00	09	54		1320	00	01	92
	1280	00	00	90		1308	00	00	70
	1279	00	00	90		1307	00	06	70
	1252	00	01	14		2888	00	01	63
	1251	00	07	16		1145	00	07	73
	1253	00	00	12		1146	00	01	40
	1257	00	02	08		2887	00	00	10
	1256	00	00	10		1143	00	03	47
	2849	00	02	46		1144	00	03	54
	1258	00	00	97	कमनिष्ण	816	00	00	53
	2819	00	01	18		814	00	03	05
	1235	00	03	38		429	00	01	01

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कमनिष्ण (जारी)	813	00	04	42	सप्तसज्या	1495	00	04	71
	812	00	02	72		1496	00	10	07
	811	00	03	06		1497	00	03	28
	810	00	02	26		1498	00	03	21
	809	00	00	10		1499	00	02	99
	808	00	01	18		1500	00	02	47
	798	00	00	10		1441	00	00	79
	799	00	01	09		1638	00	05	43
	800	00	03	36		1440	00	06	48
	801	00	01	72		1419	00	05	10
	802	00	02	21		1416	00	04	83
	803	00	02	15		1413	00	05	37
	804	00	02	37		1412	00	02	82
	805	00	04	36		1423	00	17	15
	758	00	00	63		1409	00	03	51
	807	00	00	10		1408	00	02	54
	434	00	07	86		1407	00	05	60
	435	00	14	37		1406	00	04	14
	438	00	00	10		1363	00	09	45
	345	00	03	13		1639	00	04	26
	864	00	05	87		1360	00	16	71
	344	00	06	98		1364	00	00	53
	322	00	10	39		1359	00	05	04
	317	00	11	98		1358	00	05	20
	318	00	04	82		1661	00	03	57
	320	00	00	22		1662	00	06	06
	319	00	05	23		1350	00	04	28
	305	00	22	68		1357	00	00	20
	304	00	03	31		1311	00	04	10
	297	00	04	70		1312	00	04	42
	296	00	04	63		1313	00	01	70
	274	00	10	54		1314	00	07	72
	273	00	12	47		1319	00	00	76
	898	00	09	51		1296	00	00	40
	897	00	07	91		1308	00	00	10
	896	00	07	38		1529	00	01	65
	258	00	13	93		1530	00	01	80
	250	00	01	31		1320	00	02	11
	256	00	07	33		1287	00	00	30
	251	00	17	15		1531	00	01	65
	252	00	12	71		1532	00	01	96
	242	00	26	41		1533	00	01	90
	243	00	03	62		1534	00	04	20
	916	00	02	92		1535	00	01	50

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
सप्तसज्या (जारी)	1536	00	00	71	सप्तसज्या (जारी)	708	00	05	71
	1537	00	00	30		707	00	19	05
	1538	00	00	40		709	00	65	00
	1290	00	03	83		710	00	09	50
	1291	00	01	70		712	00	03	36
	1292	00	00	60		713	00	21	00
	1272	00	00	10		787	00	13	22
	1271	00	05	18		784	00	15	20
	1270	00	09	66		786	00	02	00
	1269	00	04	48		785	00	00	80
	1268	00	00	44		720	00	56	80
	1267	00	04	16		718	00	07	00
	1266	00	01	87		717	00	18	70
	1265	00	01	96		716	00	56	80
	1264	00	02	03		725	00	00	80
	1263	00	01	35		726	00	02	00
	652	00	00	10		30	00	05	10
	656	00	00	10		29	00	04	20
	657	00	00	13		28	00	07	20
	660	00	00	17		27	00	06	00
	661	00	00	18		31	00	31	20
	662	00	01	55		11	00	13	22
	663	00	01	29		10	00	21	40
	664	00	01	92		1621	00	21	50
	665	00	01	59		4	00	03	47
	668	00	00	20		5	00	35	28
	667	00	00	24		1	00	84	63
	666	00	01	38		6	00	11	50
	686	00	01	83	मंगलपुर	3361	00	45	98
	684	00	00	27		3358	00	13	73
	685	00	01	60		972	00	00	81
	683	00	00	29		970	00	07	67
	687	00	03	17		971	00	01	02
	682	00	00	16		969	00	02	00
	681	00	00	10		968	00	01	31
	680	00	00	10		961	00	00	70
	689	00	21	09		962	00	08	73
	1570	00	03	54		964	00	00	10
	693	00	02	07		963	00	01	25
	1543	00	08	69		951	00	09	21
	1542	00	14	10		950	00	00	52
	1541	00	05	82		952	00	02	20
	1540	00	03	52		953	00	00	40
	1569	00	04	05		925	00	07	07

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मंगलपुर (जारी)	927	00	00	18	मंगलपुर (जारी)	93	00	03	64
	924	00	15	65		86	00	10	70
	923	00	00	56		84	00	05	37
	893	00	03	50		85	00	07	82
	894	00	02	43		81	00	05	08
	896	00	06	46		82	00	00	51
	876	00	00	10		3509	00	03	17
	897	00	01	44		3566	00	09	10
	898	00	02	89		76	00	07	07
	899	00	02	46		77	00	01	28
	875	00	01	12	मजुरि	213	00	20	32
	874	00	02	48		198	00	09	27
	873	00	01	86		197	00	02	40
	864	00	01	88		196	00	01	94
	863	00	09	72		195	00	04	57
	865	00	00	15		190	00	03	05
	859	00	11	86		232	00	02	02
	739	00	02	52		200	00	00	47
	765	00	00	46		201	00	00	10
	757	00	10	52		245	00	05	03
	756	00	00	28		188	00	06	83
	752	00	00	86		189	00	01	72
	758	00	02	91		176	00	10	08
	759	00	00	10		175	00	04	02
	749	00	07	82		174	00	03	67
	750	00	05	07		173	00	03	84
	748	00	04	17		237	00	01	75
	745	00	00	10		111	00	03	73
	746	00	00	78		247	00	01	05
	747	00	01	33		110	00	03	60
	3414	00	05	24		229	00	00	49
	3413	00	00	31		99	00	03	19
	481	00	09	60		108	00	00	96
	520	00	01	70		100	00	05	94
	483	00	06	07		253	00	00	72
	491	00	00	82		101	00	03	48
	484	00	01	40		102	00	00	10
	485	00	09	30		107	00	00	10
	487	00	02	17		80	00	00	67
	488	00	00	40		79	00	02	97
	424	00	09	92		76	00	00	40
	423	00	01	35		77	00	01	62
	91	00	09	92		227	00	01	21
	90	00	00	14		75	00	01	48

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मजुरि (जारी)	74	00	04	91	कन्कडाहाड (जारी)	745	00	18	76
	72	00	01	03		687	00	03	32
	73	00	03	78		688	00	00	10
	62	00	01	39		691	00	09	29
	66	00	01	00		692	00	05	47
	65	00	03	13		679	00	01	55
	64	00	00	34		610	00	03	05
	63	00	00	10		678	00	02	56
	47	00	04	17		677	00	00	40
	46	00	04	87		609	00	00	10
	44	00	01	21		611	00	05	15
	43	00	00	60		618	00	00	31
	45	00	02	57		619	00	00	94
	40	00	01	36		620	00	03	23
	38	00	00	62		676	00	00	10
	39	00	02	31		626	00	00	26
	37	00	00	10		621	00	03	22
	224	00	00	96		625	00	01	00
	32	00	00	89		623	00	00	15
	223	00	00	76		624	00	09	96
	20	00	02	68		586	00	00	52
	22	00	00	10		627	00	00	23
	218	00	01	14		584	00	05	38
	13	00	01	98		585	00	04	40
	12	00	05	73		580	00	00	36
	21	00	01	27		556	00	06	81
	11	00	00	66		579	00	00	10
	9	00	02	73		555	00	02	15
	244	00	02	61		557	00	02	23
	8	00	03	16		558	00	02	58
	7	00	05	70		562	00	00	10
	6	00	00	10		550	00	01	74
	5	00	06	09		2004	00	00	10
	4	00	03	81		549	00	15	40
	3	00	00	10		548	00	01	70
	238	00	03	82		547	00	00	45
	2	00	02	52		128	00	02	26
	1	00	04	29		127	00	07	40
कन्कडाहाड	798	00	00	17		126	00	06	25
	749	00	01	66		123	00	00	37
	1999	00	00	37		125	00	13	52
	750	00	02	10		124	00	00	10
	748	00	05	36					
	1998	00	00	57					

[सं. आर-25011/25/2009-आ.आर.]

बी. के. दत्त, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S.O. 163.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of Petroleum products from Paradip (Orissa) to Raipur (Chhattisgarh) and Ranchi (Jharkhand), "Paradip-New Sambalpur-Raipur-Ranchi Pipeline" should be laid by Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the Land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, (50 of 1962) the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Sri Sukanta Kumar Pradhan, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Paradip, New Sambalpur, Raipur, Ranchi Pipeline Project, 1295, Forest Park, Bhubaneswar-751009, (Orissa).

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Dhenkanal District : Dhenkanal State : Orissa

Name of the Village	Plot No.	Area		
		Hectare	Are	Square Metre
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Depada	1237	00	02	95
	1191	00	02	20
	1190	00	00	17
	1188	00	07	45
	1187	00	02	54
	1186	00	02	88
	1185	00	00	14
	1183	00	00	15
	1184	00	07	78
	1212	00	04	04
	1178	00	02	62
	1177	00	01	31
	1176	00	06	36
	1173	00	00	23
	1138	00	04	77

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Depada—Contd.	1115	00	08	30
	1114	00	12	45
	1113	00	02	97
	1124	00	00	24
	1126	00	00	10
	1112	00	09	64
	1093	00	04	38
	1094	00	08	11
	1095	00	00	75
	1101	00	02	38
	1096	00	07	58
	1097	00	01	35
	1098	00	00	82
	1099	00	00	17
	1088	00	04	37
Manipur	2591	00	15	77
	2590	00	04	36
	1903	00	07	39
	2706	00	05	03
	2586	00	07	32
	1910	00	02	07
	2707	00	02	35
	2585	00	00	10
	1912	00	17	92
	1926	00	02	18
	2797	00	03	36
	1925	00	08	22
	1927	00	00	10
	1924	00	02	45
	1935	00	05	83
	1936	00	06	00
	1937	00	04	19
	1941	00	00	84
	1940	00	02	66
	1939	00	03	32
	1942	00	01	33
	1734	00	02	53
	1735	00	01	51
	1733	00	06	11
	1731	00	04	17
	2721	00	01	23
	1730	00	03	27
	1729	00	03	48
	1741	00	00	31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Manipur— <i>Contd.</i>	1727	00	00	10	Manipur— <i>Contd.</i>	1144	00	05	81
	1742	00	11	15		1166	00	00	20
	1744	00	03	86		1143	00	01	65
	1745	00	00	10		1142	00	04	20
	1743	00	02	01		1141	00	01	52
	1675	00	13	04		1140	00	00	10
	1677	00	00	10		2807	00	04	82
	1676	00	01	72		1134	00	02	14
	1680	00	04	28		1126	00	05	15
	1673	00	04	94		1132	00	02	85
	1672	00	07	64		1131	00	00	20
	1683	00	00	10		1128	00	00	20
	2826	00	04	31		1127	00	03	21
	1505	00	04	78		1121	00	06	06
	1492	00	08	25		2726	00	00	20
	1504	00	00	10		2672	00	04	42
	1503	00	07	74		1009	00	09	13
	1502	00	04	96		1008	00	03	21
	1501	00	03	35		1007	00	16	67
	1511	00	00	85		982	00	01	89
	1510	00	05	32		981	00	14	13
	1512	00	00	65		975	00	04	54
	1513	00	04	11		976	00	05	66
	1514	00	08	63		977	00	00	30
	1516	00	00	90		974	00	16	29
	1515	00	07	26		918	00	05	22
	1517	00	03	61		920	00	00	20
	1543	00	02	48		919	00	00	80
	1385	00	00	10		916	00	05	62
	1384	00	06	88		2875	00	05	66
	1383	00	02	11		2874	00	02	68
	1382	00	00	10		915	00	05	35
	1372	00	00	42	Patarabhaga	2734	00	02	99
	1373	00	00	10		2733	00	09	78
	1381	00	03	44		2732	00	05	09
	1377	00	01	73		3020	00	01	57
	1376	00	02	02		3022	00	04	76
	1152	00	02	58		2740	00	03	01
	1156	00	00	10		2741	00	00	10
	1154	00	02	23		2704	00	03	89
	1153	00	04	05		2743	00	00	10
	1155	00	00	26		2703	00	05	04
	1150	00	05	64		2702	00	11	70
	1149	00	00	71		2700	00	04	64

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Patarabhaga	2699	00	00	10	Patarabhaga	1986	00	03	75
—Contd.	2698	00	06	94	—Contd.	1915	00	00	20
	2696	00	04	81		1916	00	03	10
	2692	00	08	27		1985	00	11	62
	2691	00	13	45		1917	00	02	91
	2685	00	01	76		1921	00	01	37
	2634	00	00	75		1919	00	03	53
	2635	00	02	74		1920	00	02	52
	2637	00	00	50		1908	00	14	68
	2636	00	02	23		1881	00	02	87
	2625	00	00	10		1882	00	06	02
	2624	00	01	97		1880	00	06	44
	2638	00	00	11		1883	00	11	06
	2622	00	05	51		1876	00	13	12
	2623	00	03	47		1875	00	24	85
	2621	00	00	10		1843	00	06	01
	2650	00	01	53		1842	00	04	49
	2649	00	02	67		1841	00	03	12
	2651	00	00	12		1844	00	04	80
	2662	00	01	59		1839	00	02	09
	2648	00	02	00		1840	00	01	28
	2663	00	01	55		2837	00	00	25
	2664	00	04	13		1768	00	00	36
	2665	00	03	35		1760	00	08	59
	2660	00	00	39		1766	00	04	12
	2807	00	03	45		1765	00	03	11
	2666	00	00	10		1633	00	00	46
	2659	00	09	41		1764	00	03	26
	2658	00	02	02		1763	00	01	20
	2506	00	13	03		1636	00	06	34
	2505	00	01	04		1637	00	06	17
	2502	00	07	41		1638	00	06	27
	2501	00	06	93		1639	00	01	40
	2500	00	00	34		1646	00	05	05
	2499	00	10	08		1642	00	00	10
	2496	00	02	24		1641	00	01	02
	2491	00	03	31		1647	00	02	87
	2495	00	04	70		1646	00	01	13
	2492	00	02	20		1645	00	03	00
	2493	00	06	15		1644	00	00	33
	2484	00	14	77		2885	00	01	82
	2482	00	00	13		1658	00	03	68
	1998	00	02	85		1660	00	00	33
	1914	00	02	28		1659	00	03	76

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Patarabhaga	2818	00	00	92	Patarabhaga	1235	00	03	38
—Contd.	2817	00	00	74	—Contd.	2903	00	02	61
	1614	00	01	72		1236	00	01	01
	1661	00	01	76		2910	00	05	72
	1601	00	01	30		1219	00	02	27
	1602	00	01	10		1221	00	03	43
	1600	00	09	61		1222	00	04	60
	1599	00	00	95		1196	00	00	15
	1585	00	01	53		1192	00	01	20
	1584	00	08	00		1193	00	01	40
	1583	00	00	62		1195	00	02	47
	1564	00	00	29		1190	00	00	10
	1582	00	00	16		1194	00	06	58
	2902	00	06	71		1186	00	03	87
	1588	00	04	48		1200	00	01	94
	1589	00	00	31		1201	00	00	10
	1565	00	00	52		1184	00	03	23
	1566	00	00	15		1185	00	03	20
	1567	00	00	10		1183	00	00	10
	1570	00	08	64		1164	00	00	79
	1569	00	01	20		1162	00	01	45
	1568	00	04	60		1161	00	06	36
	1558	00	00	95		2858	00	00	10
	1557	00	00	10		2892	00	02	40
	1550	00	00	99		2891	00	01	87
	1551	00	10	81		1160	00	01	05
	1528	00	00	60		2890	00	03	40
	1522	00	06	65		1151	00	08	39
	1523	00	06	40		1316	00	02	78
	1524	00	05	68		2866	00	03	48
	1525	00	06	31		1148	00	00	10
	1282	00	06	76		1147	00	05	68
	1283	00	05	84		2889	00	01	70
	1298	00	09	54		1320	00	01	92
	1280	00	00	90		1308	00	00	70
	1279	00	00	90		1307	00	06	70
	1252	00	01	14		2888	00	01	63
	1251	00	07	16		1145	00	07	73
	1253	00	00	12		1146	00	01	40
	1257	00	02	08		2887	00	00	10
	1256	00	00	10		1143	00	03	47
	2849	00	02	46		1144	00	03	54
	1258	00	00	97	Kamaning	816	00	00	53
	2819	00	01	18		814	00	03	05

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kamaning—Contd.	429	00	01	01	Shaptasajya	1495	00	04	71
	813	00	04	42		1496	00	10	07
	812	00	02	72		1497	00	03	28
	811	00	03	06		1498	00	03	21
	810	00	02	26		1499	00	02	99
	809	00	00	10		1500	00	02	47
	808	00	01	18		1441	00	00	79
	798	00	00	10		1638	00	05	43
	799	00	01	09		1440	00	06	48
	800	00	03	36		1419	00	05	10
	801	00	01	72		1416	00	04	83
	802	00	02	21		1413	00	05	37
	803	00	02	15		1412	00	02	82
	804	00	02	37		1423	00	17	15
	805	00	04	36		1409	00	03	51
	758	00	00	63		1408	00	02	54
	807	00	00	10		1407	00	05	60
	434	00	07	86		1406	00	04	14
	435	00	14	37		1363	00	09	45
	438	00	00	10		1639	00	04	26
	345	00	03	13		1360	00	16	71
	864	00	05	87		1364	00	00	53
	344	00	06	98		1359	00	05	04
	322	00	10	39		1358	00	05	20
	317	00	11	98		1661	00	03	57
	318	00	04	82		1662	00	06	06
	320	00	00	22		1350	00	04	28
	319	00	05	23		1357	00	00	20
	305	00	22	68		1311	00	04	10
	304	00	03	31		1312	00	04	42
	297	00	04	70		1313	00	01	70
	296	00	04	63		1314	00	07	72
	274	00	10	54		1319	00	00	76
	273	00	12	47		1296	00	00	40
	898	00	09	51		1308	00	00	10
	897	00	07	91		1529	00	01	65
	896	00	07	38		1530	00	01	80
	258	00	13	93		1320	00	02	11
	250	00	01	31		1287	00	00	30
	256	00	07	33		1531	00	01	65
	251	00	17	15		1532	00	01	96
	252	00	12	71		1533	00	01	90
	242	00	26	41		1534	00	04	20
	243	00	03	62		1535	00	01	50
	916	00	02	92					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Shaptasajya	1536	00	00	71	Shaptasajya	708	00	05	77
(Contd.)	1537	00	00	30	(Contd.)	707	00	19	05
	1538	00	00	40		709	00	65	63
	1290	00	03	83		710	00	09	53
	1291	00	01	70		712	00	05	36
	1292	00	00	60		713	00	21	00
	1272	00	00	10		787	00	11	22
	1271	00	05	18		784	00	15	26
	1270	00	09	66		786	00	02	01
	1269	00	04	48		785	00	00	83
	1268	00	00	44		720	00	56	87
	1267	00	04	16		718	00	07	01
	1266	00	01	87		717	00	18	70
	1265	00	01	96		716	00	56	85
	1264	00	02	03		725	00	00	10
	1263	00	01	35		726	00	02	40
	652	00	00	10		30	00	03	19
	656	00	00	10		29	00	04	75
	657	00	00	13		28	00	07	32
	660	00	00	17		27	00	06	61
	661	00	00	18		31	00	31	34
	662	00	01	55		11	00	13	42
	663	00	01	29		10	00	21	43
	664	00	01	92		1621	00	21	50
	665	00	01	59		4	00	03	47
	668	00	00	20		5	00	35	28
	667	00	00	24		1	00	84	68
	666	00	01	38		6	00	11	50
	686	00	01	83	Mangalpur	3361	00	45	98
	684	00	00	27		3358	00	13	73
	685	00	01	60		972	00	00	81
	683	00	00	29		970	00	07	67
	687	00	03	17		971	00	01	02
	682	00	00	16		969	00	02	00
	681	00	00	10		968	00	01	31
	680	00	00	10		961	00	00	70
	689	00	21	09		962	00	08	73
	1570	00	03	54		964	00	00	10
	693	00	02	07		963	00	01	25
	1543	00	08	69		951	00	09	21
	1542	00	14	10		950	00	00	52
	1541	00	05	82		952	00	02	20
	1540	00	03	52		953	00	00	40
	1569	00	04	05		925	00	07	07

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Mangalpur	927	00	00	18	Mangalpur	93	00	03	64
(Contd.)	924	00	15	65	(Contd.)	86	00	10	70
	923	00	00	56		84	00	05	37
	893	00	03	50		85	00	07	82
	894	00	02	43		81	00	05	08
	896	00	06	46		82	00	00	51
	876	00	00	10		3509	00	03	17
	897	00	01	44		3566	00	09	10
	898	00	02	89		76	00	07	07
	899	00	02	46		77	00	01	28
	875	00	01	12	Majuri	213	00	20	32
	874	00	02	48		198	00	09	27
	873	00	01	86		197	00	02	40
	864	00	01	88		196	00	01	94
	863	00	09	72		195	00	04	57
	865	00	00	15		190	00	03	05
	859	00	11	86		232	00	02	02
	739	00	02	52		200	00	00	47
	765	00	00	46		201	00	00	10
	757	00	10	52		245	00	05	03
	756	00	00	28		188	00	06	83
	752	00	00	86		189	00	01	72
	758	00	02	91		176	00	10	08
	759	00	00	10		175	00	04	02
	749	00	07	82		174	00	03	67
	750	00	05	07		173	00	03	84
	748	00	04	17		237	00	01	75
	745	00	00	10		111	00	03	73
	746	00	00	78		247	00	01	05
	747	00	01	33		110	00	03	60
	3414	00	05	24		229	00	00	49
	3413	00	00	31		99	00	03	19
	481	00	09	60		108	00	00	96
	520	00	01	70		100	00	05	94
	483	00	06	07		253	00	00	72
	491	00	00	82		101	00	03	48
	484	00	01	40		102	00	00	10
	485	00	09	30		107	00	00	10
	487	00	02	17		80	00	00	67
	488	00	00	40		79	00	02	97
	424	00	09	92		76	00	00	40
	423	00	01	35		77	00	01	62
	91	00	09	92		227	00	01	21
	90	00	00	14		75	00	01	48

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Majuri	74	00	04	91	Kankadahada	745	00	18	76
(Contd.)	72	00	01	03	(Contd.)	687	00	03	32
	73	00	03	78		688	00	00	10
	62	00	01	39		691	00	09	29
	66	00	01	00		692	00	05	47
	65	00	03	13		679	00	01	55
	64	00	00	34		610	00	03	05
	63	00	00	10		678	00	02	56
	47	00	04	17		677	00	00	40
	46	00	04	87		609	00	00	10
	44	00	01	21		611	00	05	15
	43	00	00	60		618	00	00	31
	45	00	02	57		619	00	00	94
	40	00	01	36		620	00	03	23
	38	00	00	62		676	00	00	10
	39	00	02	31		626	00	00	26
	37	00	00	10		621	00	03	22
	224	00	00	96		625	00	01	00
	32	00	00	89		623	00	00	15
	223	00	00	76		624	00	09	96
	20	00	02	68		586	00	00	52
	22	00	00	10		627	00	00	23
	218	00	01	14		584	00	05	38
	13	00	01	98		585	00	04	40
	12	00	05	73		580	00	00	36
	21	00	01	27		556	00	06	81
	11	00	00	66		579	00	00	10
	9	00	02	73		555	00	02	15
	244	00	02	61		557	00	02	23
	8	00	03	16		558	00	02	58
	7	00	05	70		562	00	00	10
	6	00	00	10		550	00	01	74
	5	00	06	09		2004	00	00	10
	4	00	03	81		549	00	15	40
	3	00	00	10		548	00	01	70
	238	00	03	82		547	00	00	45
	2	00	02	52		128	00	02	26
	1	00	04	29		127	00	07	40
Kankadahada	798	00	00	17		126	00	06	25
	749	00	01	66		123	00	00	37
	1999	00	00	37		125	00	13	52
	750	00	02	10		124	00	00	10
	748	00	05	36					
	1998	00	00	57					

[No. R-25011/25/2009-OR-1]

B. K. DATTA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 164.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 2618, तारीख 15 सितम्बर, 2008 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 20 सितम्बर, 2008 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गुजरात राज्य में वाडीनार संस्थापन से मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में बीना तक कच्चे पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए वाडीनार-बीना पाइपलाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 4 दिसम्बर, 2008 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, भारत ओमान रिफाइनरी लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : राजगढ़		जिला : राजगढ़	राज्य : मध्य प्रदेश
क्र. सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हैक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
1.	खजूरी	800	0.020
		696	0.225
		361/4	0.060
		42	0.035
2.	तुमड़िया खेड़ी	39/2	0.253
3.	गोरखपुरा	327	0.377
4.	किशन पुरिया	163	0.020
5.	पीपल्ले पुरोहित	391/1	1.317
		391/2	

1	2	3	4
6.	घोघड़िया कलां	88 92 96	0.089 0.069 0.06
7.	अम्बा	338/6	0.020
8.	देवली कलां	29 362/2/2 318 171/2 300 139 140	0.010 0.471 0.053 0.060 0.067 0.050 0.095
9.	सावनखेड़ी	24/2	0.120
10.	रानीपुरा	2/2	0.025
11.	गोल्यादे	208/1/4	1.040
12.	भोजपुरिया	1/4	0.060
13.	पाडल्याखेड़ी	361	0.250
14.	सिन्दुरिया	244/3	0.210

[सं. आर-31015/19/2008-ओआर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S.O. 164.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 2618 dated the 15th September, 2008, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 20th September, 2008 the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of Crude Oil through Vadinar-Bina Crude Pipeline Project from Vadinar in the State of Gujarat to Bina in the State of Madhya Pradesh by Bharat Oman Refineries Limited ;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 4th December, 2008;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land, specified in the Schedule, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Oman Refineries Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Rajgarh District : Rajgarh State : Madhya Pradesh

S. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4
1.	Khajuri	800	0.020
		696	0.225
		361/4	0.060
2.	Tumadiya Khedi	42	0.035
		39/2	0.253
3.	Gorakhpura	327	0.377
4.	Kisan Puriya	163	0.020
5.	Piplabe Purohit	391/1	
		391/2	1.317
6.	Ghoghadiyakalan	88	0.089
		92	0.069
		96	0.06
7.	Amba	338/6	0.020
8.	Dewali Kalan	29	0.010
		362/2/2	0.471
		318	0.053
		171/2	0.060
		300	0.067
		139	0.050
		140	0.095
9.	Savan khedi	24/2	0.120
10.	Ranipura	2/2	0.025
11.	Goliabe	208/1/4	1.040
12.	Bhojpuriya	1/4	0.060
13.	Padliyakhedi	361	0.250
14.	Sinduriya	244/3	0.210

[No. R-31015/19/2008-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 165.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 373, तारीख 5 फरवरी, 2009 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 14 फरवरी, 2009 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गुजरात राज्य में वाडीनार संस्थापन से मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में बीना तक कच्चे पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए वाडीनार-बीना पाइपलाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन

बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 16 मार्च, 2009 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, भारत ओमान रिफाइनरी लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : ब्यावरा जिला : राजगढ़ (ब्यावरा) राज्य : मध्य प्रदेश

क्र. सं. ग्राम का नाम सर्वे नंबर क्षेत्रफल हैक्टेयर में

1	2	3	4
1.	कनाड़िया खेड़ी	12/2	0.450
2.	नापानेरा	181/5	0.200
		614/2	0.490
3.	पीपल्या पेड़त	64	0.100
4.	देहरी खेड़ा	30/3	0.150
		319/30	0.230
5.	भूकनी	11/2	0.170
		11/3/1	0.130
		11/4/1	0.129
		11/4/2	0.127
		11/4/3	0.126
		11/4/5	0.128
		11/4/6	0.129
6.	गुलजारपुरा	30/3	0.253
		34/2	0.097
7.	बांकपुरा	142	0.010
		158/1	0.010
		253/156	0.070
8.	लालपुरा	37	0.200
9.	बरखेड़ी	157	0.051
10.	भगवानपुरा	19	0.144

[सं. आर 31015/3/2009-ओआर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S.O. 165.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 373 dated the 5th February, 2009, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 14th February, 2009 the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of Crude Oil through Vadinar-Bina Crude Pipeline Project from Vadinar in the State of Gujarat to Bina in the State of Madhya Pradesh by Bharat Onam Refineries Limited ;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 16th March, 2009;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land, specified in the Schedule, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Onam Refineries Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Biora District : Rajgarh State : Madhya Pradesh

S. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4
1.	Kanadiya Khedi	12/2	0.450
2.	Napanera	181/5	0.200
		614/2	0.490
3.	Pipliya Pedat	64	0.100
4.	Dehari Kheda	30/3	0.150
		319/30	0.230
5.	Bhukani	11/2	0.170
		11/3/1	0.130
		11/4/1	0.129

1	2	3	4
		11/4/2	0.127
		11/4/3	0.126
		11/4/5	0.128
		11/4/6	0.129
6.	Guljarpura	30/3	0.253
		34/2	0.097
7.	Bankpura	142	0.010
		158/1	0.010
		253/156	0.070
8.	Lalpura	37	0.200
9.	Barkhedi	157	0.051
10.	Bhagwanpura	19	0.144

[No. R-31015-3/2009-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 166.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 372 तारीख 5 फरवरी, 2009 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 14 फरवरी, 2009 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गुजरात राज्य में वाडीनार संस्थापन से मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में बीना तक कच्चे पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए वाडीनार-बीना पाइपलाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता का तारीख 10 मार्च, 2009 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगों से मुक्त, भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड में निहित होगा ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : सारंगपुर जिला : राजगढ़ (ब्यावरा) राज्य : मध्यप्रदेश

क्र. सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
1.	सेमली लोड़ा	675/2	0.061
2.	निपान्या तुला	734	0.132
		732	0.085
		786/3	0.060
		786/2	
		786/1	0.060
		795	0.020
		796/3	0.023
		796/2	0.030
		797	0.020
		682/3	0.232
3.	भ्याना	275/1	0.101
		280/1	0.050
		280/2	0.050
		282/1	0.070
		278/1/1	0.300
4.	देंदला	482/1	0.030
		482/2	0.030
5.	शामगी घाटा	525/1	0.180
		385/5	0.540
6.	पठारी	328/3	0.015
		299/3/1	0.150
7.	बरखेडी खुर्रम	180/1	0.018
		180/2	0.013
		329/1	0.014
		329/2	0.014
		329/3	0.014
		329/4	0.014
		334/1	0.150
8.	खंजरपुर	1/5/1	0.230
		1/5/2	0.030
		1/5/26	0.015
9.	खजुरिया घाटा	32/1	0.090

[सं. आर-31015/2/2009-ओआर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S.O. 166.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 372 dated the 5th February, 2009, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 14th February, 2009 the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of Crude Oil through Vadinar-Bina Crude Pipeline Project from Vadinar

in the State of Gujarat to Bina in the State of Madhya Pradesh by Bharat Onam refineries Limited.

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 10th March, 2009:

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land, specified in the Schedule, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline:

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Oman Refineries Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Sarangpur

District : Rajgarh
State : Madhya Pradesh

S. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4
1.	Semiloda	675/	0.061
2.	Nipaniyatula	734	0.132
		732	0.085
		786/3	0.060
		786/2	
		786/1	0.060
		795	0.020
		796/3	0.023
		796/2	0.030
		797	0.020
		682/3	0.232
3.	Bhyana	275/1	0.101
		280/1	0.050
		280/2	0.050
		282/1	0.070
		278/1/1	0.300
4.	Daidala	482/1	0.030
		482/2	0.030
5.	Samgi Ghata	525/1	0.180
		385/5	0.540
6.	Pathari	328/3	0.015
		299/3/1	0.150
7.	Barkheda Khurram	180/1	0.018
		180/2	0.013

1	2	3	4
		329/1	0.014
		329/2	0.014
		329/3	0.014
		329/4	0.014
		334/1	0.150
8.	Khanjarpur	1/5/1	0.230
		1/5/2	0.030
		1/5/26	0.015
9.	Khajuriya Ghata	32/1	0.090

[No. R-31015/2/2009-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 167.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 137 तारीख 20 जनवरी, 2009 जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 24 जनवरी, 2009 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गुजरात राज्य में वाडीनार संस्थापन से मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में बीना तक कच्चे पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए वाडीनार-बीना पाइपलाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिमूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 17 जून, 2009 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, सभी विल्लंगों से मुक्त, भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड में निहित होगा ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : सिरोंज जिला : विदिशा राज्य : मध्यप्रदेश

क्र. सं.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
1.	देवीटोरी	146	0.816

1	2	3	4
2.	नरखेड़ाताल	401/2	0.011
3.	कस्बासिरोंज	1130	0.026

[सं. आर-31015/41/2008-ओआर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S.O. 167.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 137 dated the 20th January, 2009, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 24th January, 2009 the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land, specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of Crude Oil through Vadinar-Bina Crude Pipeline Project from Vadinar in the State of Gujarat to Bina in the State of Madhya Pradesh by Bharat Oman Refineries Limited ;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 17th June, 2009;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the Said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire the right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land, specified in the Schedule, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration, in Bharat Oman Refineries Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Sironj District : Vidisha State : Madhya Pradesh

S. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4
1.	Devi Tori	146	0.816
2.	Narkhedatal	401/2	0.011
3.	Kasba Sironj	1130	0.026

[No. R-31015/41/2008-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का. आ. 168.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 2488 दिनांक 09.09.09, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, रमन मंडी (पंजाब राज्य में) से बहादुरगढ़ (हरियाणा राज्य में) तक, पेट्रोलियम उत्पाद के परिवहन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "जी जी एस आर उत्पाद निष्क्रमण परियोजना रमन मंडी से बहादुरगढ़ पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील महम जिला रोहतक राज्य हरियाणा की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 10.11.2009 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : महम		जिला : रोहतक		राज्य : हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. चान्दी	93	233	16	00	01	77
			25/2	00	09	36
		224	21	00	12	39
			22	00	01	26
		229	1	00	01	01
			2	00	06	32
			3	00	11	38
			4	00	00	25
		224	21	00	12	39
			22	00	01	26

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
			6	00	08	60
			7	00	12	90
			8	00	02	53
			15	00	03	79
			26	00	05	81
	228		11	00	13	15
			12	00	03	28
			17	00	02	27
			18/1	00	04	55
			18/2	00	06	57
			18/3	00	06	57
			19	00	08	09
			23/1	00	00	25
			24	00	11	38
			25	00	11	13
	227		21	00	01	26
	252		1	00	03	03
	251		5	00	00	75

[फा. सं. आर. - 31015/6/2009-ओ.आर.-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S. O. 168.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 2488 dated the 9th September, 2009, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Products from Raman Mandi in the State of Punjab to Bahadurgarh in the State of Haryana by the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited for implementing the "GGSR Products Evacuation Project pipeline from Raman Mandi to Bahadurgarh" in Tehsil **Maham**, District **Rohtak**, in **Haryana State**;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 10.11.2009.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : MAHAM		District : ROHTAK		State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. CHANDI	93	233	16	00	01	77
			25/2	00	09	36
		224	21	00	12	39
			22	00	01	26
		229	1	00	01	01
			2	00	06	32
			3	00	11	38
			4	00	00	25
			6	00	08	60
			7	00	12	90
			8	00	02	53
			15	00	03	79
			26	00	05	81

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		228	11	00	13	15
			12	00	03	28
			17	00	02	27
			18/1	00	04	55
			18/2	00	06	57
			18/3	00	06	57
			19	00	08	09
			23/1	00	00	25
			24	00	11	38
			25	00	11	13
		227	21	00	01	26
		252	1	00	03	03
		251	5	00	00	75

[F. No. R 31015/6/2009-O.R. II]
A. GOSWAMI Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 2010

का. आ. 169.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का.आ. 2871 दिनांक 15.10.09, द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा जायेगा) की धारा 3(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, रमन मंडी से भटिंडा (पंजाब राज्य में) तक, पेट्रोलियम उत्पाद के परिवहन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा "जी जी एस आर उत्पाद निष्क्रमण परियोजना रमन मंडी से भटिंडा पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन" के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट तहसील भटिंडा जिला भटिंडा राज्य पंजाब की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी,

और, उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 26.11.2009 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी,

और, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी वित्तीयगमों से मुक्त होकर हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : भटिंडा		जिला : भटिंडा		राज्य : पंजाब		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्ततिल संख्या	खसरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. गहरी देवीनगर	63		1527/1	00	16	69
2. कोट समीर	57	247	14	00	09	36
			17	00	11	13
			24	00	09	10
		286	4	00	04	04
		305	24	00	01	51
		344	4	00	04	55
			7	00	06	83
			14/2	00	05	56
			17	00	04	55
			24	00	03	03
		365	4	00	01	51
			14	00	03	54
			17	00	00	25
3. कटारसिंह वाला	62		52	00	05	06
			119/1	00	01	01
			119/2/2	00	00	25
			119/2/3	00	02	53
			128	00	00	25
			130	00	00	25
			141/1	00	02	53
			141/2	00	09	61
			142	00	04	80
			176/1/1	00	00	25
			177	00	25	55

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
			179	00	26	05
			180	00	00	50
			956/182/1	00	08	85
			956/182/2	00	06	57
			312	00	04	04
			351	00	17	96
			354	00	06	83
			359/3	00	27	32
			360/2	00	21	75
			404	00	00	50
			405	00	04	30
			406	00	17	45
			478	00	05	81

[फा. सं. आर.-31015/40/2009-ओ.आर.-II]

ए. गोम्वाभी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2010

S. O. 169.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 2871 dated the 15th Oct. 2009, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Products from Raman Mandi to Bhatinda in the State of Punjab by the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited for implementing the "GGSR Products Evacuation Project pipeline from Raman Mandi to Bhatinda " in Tehsil Bhatinda , District Bhatinda , in **Punjab** State;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 26.11.09.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of users in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : BHATINDA		District :BHATINDA		State : PUNJAB			
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustatil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area			
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
1. GAHRI DEVINAGAR	63		1527/1	00	16	69	
2. KOT SAMIR	57	247	14	00	09	36	
			17	00	11	13	
			24	00	09	10	
			286	4	00	04	04
			305	24	00	01	51
			344	4	00	04	55
			7	00	06	83	
			14/2	00	05	56	
			17	00	04	55	
			24	00	03	03	
			365	4	00	01	51
				</			

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
			179	00	26	05
			180	00	00	50
			956/182/1	00	08	85
			956/182/2	00	06	57
			312	00	04	04
			351	00	17	96
			354	00	06	83
			359/3	00	27	32
			360/2	00	21	75
			404	00	00	50
			405	00	04	30
			406	00	17	45
			478	00	05	81

[F. No. R-31015/40/2009-O.R.-II]

A.GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 जनवरी, 2010

का. आ. 170.— पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के नियम 2 (क) के अन्तर्गत, मैसर्स रिलायंस गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड (आर.जी.टी. आई.एल.) के द्वारा महाराष्ट्र राज्य में प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने हेतु सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कार्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की, भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 22 जनवरी, 2005 को प्रकाशित, अधिमूचना का0आ0 259 दिनांक 18 जनवरी, 2005 द्वारा प्राधिकृत, में, डी.एस. धोत्रे, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियमावली, 1963 के नियम 4 के उप-नियम (1) के नीचे दी गई व्याख्या (1) के अन्तर्गत अधिकारों के अनुपालन में, मैसर्स आर.जी.टी.आई.एल., जिसमें यथास्थित, उस क्षेत्र में भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार निहित किया गया है और उस क्षेत्र में पाइपलाइन का स्वामित्व निहित है, के परामर्श से, संलग्न अनुसूची के स्तंभ 4 में महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लातूर और उस्मानाबाद जिले में यथा उल्लेखित प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के प्रचालन का समाप्ति की तारीखों की घोषणा करता हूँ।

अनुसूची

तहसिल: निलंगा		जिला: लातूर		राज्य: महाराष्ट्र
क. स.	ग्राम का नाम	धारा 6(1) की का. आ. संख्या एवं दिनांक		प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3		4
1	नेलवाड	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
2	औंढा	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
3	हलसी (हतरगा)	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	

तहसिल: उमरगा		जिला: उस्मानाबाद		राज्य: महाराष्ट्र
1	नारंगवाडी	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	दिनांक 11/12/2006	
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
2	पेटसांगवी	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	30/09/2007
		4828	दिनांक 11/12/2006	
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	

तहसिल: लोहारा		जिला: उस्मानाबाद		राज्य: महाराष्ट्र
1	राजेगांव	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	दिनांक 11/12/2006	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
2	चिचोलीगवे	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
3	भातागळी	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
4	कानेगाव	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	दिनांक 11/12/2006	
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
5	अरनी	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	दिनांक 11/12/2006	
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	

1	2	3		4
	तहसिल: उस्मानाबाद	जिला: उस्मानाबाद		राज्य: महाराष्ट्र
1	नांदुरगा	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	30/09/2007
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
2	महादेववाडी	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
3	आनसुर्डा	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
4	रुईभर	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	17/05/2007
5	वडगांव	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	
6	गावसुट	1301	दिनांक 08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	दिनांक 20/09/2007	
		2904(अ)	दिनांक 06/12/2008	

पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन)
अधिनियम, १९६२ की धारा १७ के अंतर्गत संग्रहित पेट्रोलियम और खनिज
पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, १९६३ के नियम
४ के अंतर्गत भारत सरकार के राजपत्र के प्रकाशनार्थ

[फा. सं. एल. 14014/50/2009-जी.पी.]

सी.पी. मदान, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th January, 2010

S.O. 170.— In pursuance of powers conferred by Explanation 1 in sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Rules, 1963, I, D.S. Dhotre, authorised by Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas vide Notification S.O. 259 dated 18th January, 2005 (published in the Gazette of India on 22nd January, 2005) under Section 2(a) of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) to perform the functions of Competent Authority for laying natural gas pipelines by M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited (RGTEL) in the State of Maharashtra, in consultation with M/s RGTEL, to whom the Right of User in land in that area has been vested and in whom the ownership of pipeline in that area vests, hereby declare the dates, mentioned in Column 4 of the Schedule annexed herewith, as the dates of termination of RoU operation in Districts Latur and Osmanabad in the State of Maharashtra.

Schedule

Tahsil: Nilanga		District: Latur			State: Maharashtra
Sr. No.	Village	S.O. No. & Date of Notification Under sub-section (1) of Section 6			Date of Termination of Operation
1	2	3			4
1	Nelwad	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
2	Aundha	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
3	Halsi(Hatarga)	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
Tahsil: Umarga		District: Osmanabad			State: Maharashtra
1	Narangwadi	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	Date	11/12/2006	
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
2	Peth.Sangvi	1301	Date	08/04/2005	30/09/2007
		4828	Date	11/12/2006	
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
Tahsil: Lohara		District: Osmanabad			State: Maharashtra
1	Rajegaon	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	Date	11/12/2006	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
2	ChincholiRebe	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
3	Bhatagali	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
4	Kanegaon	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	Date	11/12/2006	
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
5	Arni	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		4828	Date	11/12/2006	
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	

Cont'd...3

1	2	3			4
Tahsil: Osmanabad		District: Osmanabad			State: Maharashtra
1	Nandurga	1301	Date	08/04/2005	30/09/2007
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
2	Mahadevwadi	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
3	Ansurda	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
4	Ruibhar	1301	Date	08/04/2005	17/05/2007
5	Wadgaon	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	
6	Gaosud	1301	Date	08/04/2005	15/12/2008
		2695	Date	20/09/2007	
		2904(E)	Date	06/12/2008	

To be published under Rule 4 of the P& MP (ARUL)
Rules 1963, framed under Section 17 of P& MP (ARUL)
Act, 1962 in official Gazette of India.

[F. No. L-14014/50/2009-G.P.]
S.P.MADAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 जनवरी, 2010

का. आ. 171.— पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962

(1962 का 50) के नियम 2 (क) के अन्तर्गत, मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड

(आर.जी.टी.आइ.एल) के द्वारा गुजरात राज्य में प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने हेतु सक्षम प्राधिकारी के

कार्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की, भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 11 मार्च, 2006 को प्रकाशित, अधिमूचना का.आ. 960 दिनांक 07 मार्च, 2006, द्वारा पदस्थापित, मै.वी.आइ.गोहिल, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियमावली, 1963 के नियम 4 के उप नियम (1) के नीचे दी गई व्याख्या (1) के अन्तर्गत अधिकारों के अनुपालन में, मैसर्स आर.जी.टी.आइ.एल. जिसमें यथास्थित, उस क्षेत्र में भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार निहित किया गया है और उस क्षेत्र में पाइपलाइन का स्वामित्व निहित है, के परामर्श से, संलग्न अनुमूची के स्तम्भ 4 में गुजरात राज्य के वलसाड जिले में यथा उल्लेखित प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीखों की घोषणा करता हूँ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : वलसाड		जिला : वलसाड	राज्य : गुजरात
अ.नं.	गाँव का नाम	का.आ.नं. और धारा 6(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना की तारीख	प्रचालन समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4
1	नवेरा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
2	अंजलाव	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
3	गाडरीया	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 286 तारीख 01.02.2007 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
4	कांजनहरी	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 286 तारीख 01.02.2007 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
5	ठक्करवाडा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
6	कलवाडा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
7	कोचवाडा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
8	फणसवाडा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
9	धनोरी	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 286 तारीख 01.02.2007 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
10	तीघरा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
11	गोरगाव	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009

तहसील : वलसाड		जिला : वलसाड	राज्य : गुजरात
अ.नं.	गाँव का नाम	का.आ.नंवर और धारा 6(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना की तारीख	प्रचालन समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4
12	वाघलधरा	1916 तारीख 26.05.2005 286 तारीख 01.02.2007 3073 (अ) 30.11.2009	08.12.2009

[पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 17 के अंतर्गत संस्थापित पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, 1963 के नियम 4 के अंतर्गत भारत सरकार के राजपत्र में प्रकाशनार्थ]

[फा. सं. एल-14014-51-2009-जी.पी.]

सं. पी. मदान, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th January, 2010

S. O. 171.—In pursuance of powers conferred by Explanation(I) in sub rule(I) of Rule 4 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Rules,1963, I, V.I.Gohil appointed by Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas vide Notification S.O.960 dated 07th March,2006 (Published in the Gazette of India on 11th March,2006) under Section 2(a) of the Petroleum & Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act,1962 (50 of 1962) to perform the functions of Competent Authority for laying natural gas pipelines by M/S Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited (RGTEL) in the State of Gujarat, in consultation with M/S RGTEL, to whom the Right of User in the land in that area has been vested and in whom the ownership of the pipeline in that area vests, hereby declare the dates, mentioned in Column 4 of the Schedule annexed herewith, as the dates of termination of RoU operation in District Valsad in the State of Gujarat.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Valsad		District : Valsad	State : Gujarat
Sr.No.	Village	S.O.No. and Date of Notification under sub-section (1) of Section 6	Date of Termination of Operation
1	2	3	4
1	Navera	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
2	Anjlav	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
3	Gadriya	1916 Date.26.05.2005 286 Date.01.02.2007 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
4	Kanjanhari	1916 Date.26.05.2005 286 Date.01.02.2007 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
5	Thakkarwada	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
6	Kalwada	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
7	Kochwada	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
8	Fanaswada	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
9	Dhanori	1916 Date.26.05.2005 286 Date.01.02.2007 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
10	Tighara	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
11	Gorgam	1916 Date.26.05.2005 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
12	Waghaldhara	1916 Date.26.05.2005 286 Date.01.02.2007 3073(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009

[To be published under Rule 4 of the P&MP (ARUL) Rules 1963, framed under Section 17 of P&MP (ARUL) Act, 1962 in official Gazette of India]

[F. No. I-14014/51/2009-G.P.]
S.P.MADAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 जनवरी, 2010

का. आ. 172.—पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962

(1962 का 50) के नियम 2 (क) के अन्तर्गत, मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड (आर.जी.टी.आइ.एल) के द्वारा गुजरात राज्य में प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने हेतु सक्षम प्राधिकारी के

कार्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की, भारत के राजपत्र

दिनांक 11 मार्च, 2006 को प्रकाशित, अधिसूचना का.आ. 960 दिनांक 07 मार्च, 2006, द्वारा पदस्थापित,

मै,वी.आइ.गोहिल, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियमावली, 1963

के नियम 4 के उप नियम (1) के नीचे दी गई व्याख्या (1) के अन्तर्गत अधिकारों के अनुपालन में, मैसर्स

आर.जी.टी.आइ.एल. जिसमें यथास्थित, उस क्षेत्र में भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार निहित किया गया है और उस क्षेत्र

में पाइपलाइन का स्वामित्व निहित है, के परामर्श से, संलग्न अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 4 में गुजरात राज्य के वलसाड जिले में

यथा उल्लेखित प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीखों की घोषणा करता हूँ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : वलसाड		जिला : वलसाड	राज्य : गुजरात
अ.नं.	गाँव का नाम	का.आ.नंवर और धारा 6(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना की तारीख	प्रचालन समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4
1	कांजणहरी	1569 (अ) तारीख 24.06.2009	30.06.2009
2	जुजवा	1569 (अ) तारीख 24.06.2009 3072 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
3	अटकपारडी	1569 (अ) तारीख 24.06.2009	30.06.2009

[पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 17 के अन्तर्गत संस्थापित पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, 1963 के नियम 4 के अन्तर्गत भारत सरकार के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित]

[फा. सं. एल-14014/51/2009-आ.पो.]

मन्त्रि. पा. मन्त्राल. अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th January, 2010

S. O. 172.— In pursuance of powers conferred by Explanation(I) in sub rule(I) of Rule 4 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Rules, 1963, I, V.I.Gohil appointed by Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas vide Notification S.O.960 dated 07th March, 2006 (Published in the Gazette of India on 11th March, 2006) under Section 2(a) of the Petroleum & Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) to perform the functions of Competent Authority for laying natural gas pipelines by M/S Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited (RGTIL) in the State of Gujarat, in consultation with M/S RGTIL, to whom the Right of User in the land in that area has been vested and in whom the ownership of the pipeline in that area vests, hereby declare the dates, mentioned in Column 4 of the Schedule annexed herewith, as the dates of termination of RoU operation in District Valsad in the State of Gujarat.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Valsad		District : Valsad	State : Gujarat
Sr.No.	Village	S.O.No. and Date of Notification under sub-section (1) of Section 6	Date of Termination of Operation
1	2	3	4
1	Kanjanhari	1569(E) Date.24.06.2009	30.06.2009
2	Jujwa	1569(E) Date.14.06.2009 3072(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
3	Atakpardi	1569(E) Date.24.06.2009	30.06.2009

[To be published under Rule 4 of the P&MP (ARUL) Rules 1963, framed under Section 17 of P&MP (ARUL) Act, 1962 in official Gazette of India]

[F. No. L-14014/51/2009-G.P.]
S.P.MADAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 जनवरी, 2010

का. आ. 173.—पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के नियम 2 (क) के अन्तर्गत, मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड (आर.जी.टी.आइ.एल) के द्वारा गुजरात राज्य में प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने हेतु सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कार्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की, भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 11 मार्च, 2006 को प्रकाशित, अधिसूचना का.आ. 960 दिनांक 07 मार्च, 2006, द्वारा पदस्थापित, मै,वी.आइ.गोहिल, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियमावली, 1963 के नियम 4 के उप नियम (1) के नीचे दी गई व्याख्या (1) के अन्तर्गत अधिकारों के अनुपालन में, मैसर्स आर.जी.टी.आइ.एल. जिसमें यथास्थित, उस क्षेत्र में भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार निहित किया गया है और उस क्षेत्र में पाइपलाइन का स्वामित्व निहित है, के परामर्श से, संलग्न अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 4 में गुजरात राज्य के भरुच जिले में यथा उल्लेखित प्राकृतिक गैस पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीखों की घोषणा करता हूँ ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : हंसोट		जिला : भरुच	राज्य : गुजरात
अ.नं.	गाँव का नाम	का.आ.नंवर और धारा 6(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना की तारीख	प्रचालन समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4
1	गेहीद	2064 तारीख 03.06.2005 3074 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
2	वालनेर	2064 तारीख 03.06.2005 3074 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
3	शहेरा	2064 तारीख 03.06.2005 2987 तारीख 31.10.2008 3074 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009

तहसील : भरुच		जिला : भरुच	राज्य : गुजरात.
अ.नं.	गाँव का नाम	का.आ.नंवर और धारा 6(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना की तारीख	प्रचालन समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4
1	भाडभुत	2064 तारीख 03.06.2005 2987 तारीख 31.10.2008 3074 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009
2	चोलाद	2064 तारीख 03.06.2005 3074 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009

तहसील : वागरा		जिला : भरुच	राज्य : गुजरात
अ.नं.	गाँव का नाम	का.आ.नंवर और धारा 6(1) के अधीन अधिसूचना की तारीख	प्रचालन समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4
1	भेरसम	2064 तारीख 03.06.2005 3074 (अ) तारीख 30.11.2009	08.12.2009

पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 17 के अंतर्गत संस्थापित पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, 1963 के नियम 4 के अंतर्गत भारत सरकार के राजपत्र के प्रकाशनार्थ

[फा. सं. एल-14014/28/2009-जी.पी.]

मोह पी. मदान, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th January, 2010

S. O. 173.— In pursuance of powers conferred by Explanation(I) in sub rule(I) of Rule 4 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Rules, 1963, I, V.I.Gohil appointed by Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas vide Notification S.O.960 dated 07th March, 2006 (Published in the Gazette of India on 11th March, 2006) under Section 2(a) of the Petroleum & Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) to perform the functions of Competent Authority for laying

natural gas pipelines by M/S Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited (RGTIL) in the State of Gujarat, in consultation with M/S RGTIL, to whom the Right of User in the land in that area has been vested and in whom the ownership of the pipeline in that area vests, hereby declare the dates, mentioned in Column 4 of the Schedule annexed herewith, as the dates of termination of RoU operation in District Bharuch in the State of Gujarat.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Hansot		District : Bharuch	State : Gujarat
Sr.No.	Village	S.O.No. and Date of Notification under sub-section (1) of Section 6	Date of Termination of Operation
1	2	3	4
1	Rohid	2064 Date.03.06.2005 3074(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
2	Valner	2064 Date.03.06.2005 3074(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
3	Shahera	2064 Date.03.06.2005 2987 Date.31.10.2008 3074(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009

Tehsil : Bharuch		District : Bharuch	State : Gujarat
Sr.No.	Village	S.O.No. and Date of Notification under sub-section (1) of Section 6	Date of Termination of Operation
1	2	3	4
1	Bhadbhut	2064 Date.03.06.2005 2987 Date.31.10.2008 3074(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009
2	Cholad	2064 Date.03.06.2005 3074(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009

Tehsil : Vagra		District : Bharuch	State : Gujarat
Sr.No.	Village	S.O.No. and Date of Notification under sub-section (1) of Section 6	Date of Termination of Operation
1	2	3	4
1	Bhersam	2064 Date.03.06.2005 3074(E) Date.30.11.2009	08.12.2009

[To be published under Rule 4 of the P&MP (ARUL) Rules 1963, framed under Section 17 of P&MP (ARUL) Act, 1962 in official Gazette of India]

[F. No. L-14014/28/2009-G.P.]

S.P.MADAN, Under Secy.

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 174.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी.सी. सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1 धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 263/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/100/2000-आई आर (सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2009

S.O. 174.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 263/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No.-1 Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C.L and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-12-2009.

[No. L-20012/100/2000-IR(C-1)]

SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, - NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of reference under section 10(1)(d) & 2(A) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 263 of 2000

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of Sijua Area of M/s. BCCL

AND

Their Workmen

Present : Sri H.M. Singh, Presiding Officer

For the Employers : None

For the Workmen : None

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated 4th Dec. 09

AWARD

By order No. L-20012/100/2000/IR(C-1), Dated 14-9-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of section 10 of Industrial

Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following Dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

"Whether the action of the management of Loyabad Colliery of M/s. BCCL in not regularising Sri Chhota Zamie Mia as pump operator in cat IV is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. This reference case was received in this Tribunal on 25-9-2000. Thereafter, notices were sent to the parties to file written statement by the sponsoring union workmen. In spite of notices sent by speed post no written statement has been filed by the workmen till 8-6-09. It, therefore, appears that neither the concerned workmen nor the sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

In such circumstances, I render No Dispute Award in this reference case.

H.M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 175.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ई.सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1 धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 109/1989) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/78/88 D-4(A) आई आर (सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2009

S.O. 175.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 109/1989) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No.-1 Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. E.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-12-2009.

[No. L-20012/78/88 D-4(A)-IR(C-1)]

SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of reference under section 10(1)(d) & 2(A) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 109 of 1989

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of Hariyajam Colliery of M/s. E.C.L. Ltd.

AND**Their Workmen****Present :** Shri H.M. Singh, Presiding Officer**Appearances :**

For the Employers : Shri B.M. Prasad, Advocate.

For the Workmen : None

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated the 7th December, 2009

AWARD

By order No. L-20012/78/88-D-4(A) Dated 15-9-1989 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following Dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

“Whether the action of the management of Hariajam Colliery in not regularising S/Shri Sagar Soren and 10 other concerned workmen is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?”

2. Written statement has been filed on behalf of the workmen stating that Sagar Soren and 10 other concerned workmen have been working as underground stone cutters since 1977 continuously with unblemished record of services. The concerned workmen have been performing permanent nature of job in underground under the direct control and supervision of the management. The concerned workmen have been performing prohibited category of job and they have been rendering services and producing goods for the benefits of the colliery management. The management, however, sometime engaged them in other in other permanent nature of job besides stone cutting job. All the implements for execution of the job are being supplied by the management. In spite of the aforesaid facts the management has been disbursing their wages in the name of some intermediary only to camouflage the system of exploitation. The disbursement of wages through intermediaries is nothing but legal camouflage. The concerned workman and the union represented before the management several times for their regularisation but without any effect. Thereafter an industrial dispute was raised before the A.L.C. (C), Dhanbad which ended in failure due to adamant attitude of the management. Thereafter the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication. The action of the management in not regularising the concerned workmen as stone cutters and not paying them the wages as per NCWAs is illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the provision of the law. The concerned workmen were stopped from duty without following the mandatory provision of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act. All the concerned workmen have put in 240 days attendance in each calendar year.

It has been prayed that an award passed in favour of the workmen by directing the management to regularised the concerned workmen after reinstatement.

3. The management has filed written statement stating that the reference order is vague in as much as the names of so called 10 other concerned workmen have not been given in the reference order. There was at no time any employer-employee relationship between the persons concerned and the management. The present reference has to be confined only to one person, viz. Sagar Soren and no proceeding can be held in regard to others. The union raised a similar issue earlier before the A.L.C.(C), Dhanbad and after failure of conciliation proceedings, the Central Govt. came to the conclusion that it is not a fit matter for reference to adjudication. It has been submitted that the management does not have continuous jobs such as those entrusted to the contractors, nor does the management require as regular work force. The contractors' workmen have no right to claim employment under the management and there is absolutely no question of claiming regularisation of such persons by this management. It has been stated that Eastern Coalfields Ltd. is a Central Govt. undertaking wholly financed by the Central Government and it is a "State" for the purpose of Part III of the Constitution. Such being the case, equal opportunity in the matter of employment has to be given to the different citizen of the country. It has been submitted that the management does not require the services of the persons concerned and the management cannot provide employment to the concerned persons.

It has been prayed that an award be passed in favour of the management by holding that the concerned persons are not entitled to any relief.

4. Both the parties have filed their respective rejoinders admitting and denying the contents of some of the paragraphs of each other's written statement.

5. The concerned workmen produced WW-1-Sagar Soren who has proved Exts. W-1, W-2 and W-2-1.

The management has produced MW-1-K.P. Pal, who has proved document as Ext. M-1.

6. Main argument on behalf of the management is that since more than 30 years has been passed the detailed particulars has not been filed by the concerned workmen for which application has been moved by the management. The workmen were not present in spite of the fact registered notice has been given on 8-5-2009.

7. Learned counsel of management argued that WW-1 stated in cross-examination at page 2 that "We have no paper to show that the management engaged us. There is also no paper to show that the other workmen and I have been doing the job of stone cutting. I do not know if every regular workmen of Hariajam colliery is provided with

Identity Card. It is not a fact that the management of Hariajam colliery engage contractor in underground mine for executing jobs according to the requirement of the management from time to time. He also stated in cross-examination at page 3 that I did not keep any record of our attendance showing that in each year we have put in 240 days attendance. There is nothing in writing to show that we get our wages from the counter of the management. We made representation to the management in writing demanding wages as per NCWA. We did it over 7/8 years ago. We have not filed any document supportive of the fact. This statement of the workman shows that they have never worked under the control of the management and they have not received any wages from the management and they have not worked for 240 days in each calendar year which may support any document. No reliable document has been filed by the concerned workmen.

In this respect MW-1 has stated that some work has been taken from the concerned workmen on contractual basis. Contractual work is given for a term of 15 days to one month and every contract work is completed within a space of 15 days to 30 days. Contractors engage their own workmen and supervise their jobs. Work implements for working of the contractors' workmen are supplied by the contractors themselves. Contractors pay their own workmen. It shows that the concerned workmen have never worked with the management and so they cannot be regularised.

8. In view of the facts and circumstances mentioned above, I hold that the action of the management of Hariajam Colliery in not regularising S/Shri Sagar Soren and 10 other concerned workmen is justified and accordingly, the concerned workmen are not entitled to any relief.

This is my Award.

H.M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 176.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैमर्स बी.सी. सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-I, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 311/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/109/2000-आई आर (सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2009

S.O. 176.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No.

311/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No.-1, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-12-2009.

[No. L-20012/109/2000-IR (C-1)]

SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL/LABOUR COURT (NO.1) DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference U/s 10(1)(d) & (2A) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 311 of 2000

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of
Madhuband Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.L.

And

Their Workmen

Present : Sri H.M. Singh, Presiding Officer

Appearances :

For the Employers : None

For the Workmen : None

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dated, 3rd December, 2009

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/109/2000/(C-1), Dated 18-10-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

“Whether the following demands raised by the R.C.M.S. against the management of Madhuband Colliery under Barora Area of M/s. B.C.C.L. are justified?

1. Implementation of the agreement arrived at between the rep. of RCMS and the Management of Barora Area in regard to the revision of tramming rates of new pit of Madhuband Colliery.
2. Payment of full back wages to the concerned workers along with the payment of salary.
3. Immediate payment of full back wages to the workers due since Oct. 1999.
4. Payment of actual lead and lift and pushing allowance to the miners/loaders. If so, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?”

2. This reference case was received in this Tribunal on 21-11-2000. Thereafter, notices were sent to the parties to file written statement by the sponsoring union/workmen. In spite of notices sent by speed post no written statement has been filed by the workmen till 15-9-09. It, therefore, appears that neither the concerned workmen nor the sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

In such circumstances, I render No Dispute Award in this reference case.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 177.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी.सी. सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 127/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/463/99-आई आर (सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2009

S.O. 177.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 127/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No.-1, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-12-2009.

[No. L-20012/463/99-IR (C-1)]

SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD**

In the matter of reference U/s 10(1)(d) & (2A) of I.D. Act.

Reference No. 127 of 2000

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of West Jharla area of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

Present : Sri H.M. Singh, Presiding Officer

Appearances :

For the Employers : Shri D.K. Verma Advocate

For the Workmen : None

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dated, 1st December, 2009

AWARD

By order No. L-20012/463/99(C-1), Dated 23-2-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. BCCL West Jharla Area in not accepting the resignation under VRS (Female) of the concerned workmen, Smt. Biroda Harin & providing employment to her dependant under the scheme is just and proper? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman and/or her dependant entitled?”

2. This reference case relates to the year 2000 and in spite of the notices being sent by speed post no one turned up for filing written statement on behalf of the workman even on 15-9-2009. It, therefore, appears that neither the concerned workman nor sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

Under such circumstances, I render a ‘No Dispute’ Award in the present reference case.

H.M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 178.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 238/90) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/167/90-आई आर (सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2009

S.O. 178.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 238/90) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-12-2009.

[No. L-20012/167/90-IR (C-1)]

SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of reference U/s 10(1)(d) & (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 238 of 1990

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project of M/s. BCC. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

Present : Shri H. M. Singh, Presiding Officer

Appearances :

For the Employers : Shri D. K. Verma, Advocate

For the Workmen : None

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, the 8th December, 2009

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(167)/90-IR (Coal-I), dated 1-10-1990 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

“Whether the action of the management of Moonidih Project under M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. in dismissing Shri Shyamlal Mahato, P.R. Mazdoor, Token No. 7305 under dismissal order No. MND/PO/Dismissal/39/89/997 dated 12/14-4-89 is justified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The concerned workman was employed in the post of piece rated mazdoor in Moonidih Project of M/s. BCCL in February 1987. The appointment of the concerned workman is covered by Land Looser Scheme, meaning thereby that employment is provided to the dependents of such person whose Agricultural land has been taken over by BCCL for their mining and allied purpose. The appointment was done by the General Manager, Moonidih Area vide his letter dated 22/23-2-1987. He received a charge-sheet dated 25-2-88 issued by the Superintendent of Mines, Moonidih Project. The workman submitted the explanation dated 1-3-88 to the said charge-sheet. Thereafter the management without considering the reply submitted by the workman and without holding a proper departmental enquiry issued an order of dismissal dated 12/14-4-89 under the signature of Project Officer, Moonidih Project. For the first time in the dismissal letter the Project Officer mentioned in the order of dismissal that the reply of the charge-sheet submitted by the concerned workman

was not found satisfactory as such it was decided to hold a departmental enquiry and the suptd. of Mines, Moonidih Project appointed the Dy. Personnel Manager to conduct the enquiry on the basis of the charge-sheet dated 25-2-88 issued to the concerned workman under Sec. 17(1) (O) of the Certified Standing Order. The Project Officer has further stated in the order of dismissal that he had carefully considered the report of the Enquiry Officer and the findings of the Enquiry Officer and on the basis of those documents the Project Officer dismissed the concerned workman from the service of Moonidih Project of BCCL. It has been submitted that neither the charge-sheet nor the enquiry order nor the order of dismissal was issued by the appointing authority of the concerned workman and as such the order of dismissal is without jurisdiction, arbitrary and illegal.

It has been prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an award holding that the action of the management of Moonidih Project of BCCL in dismissing the concerned workman is not justified and he should be reinstated in service with full back wages.

3. The management submitted written statement stating that the concerned workman got employment in February, 1987 as temporary miner/loader by making false declaration and swearing in a false affidavit to the effect that he is the son of Nakur Mahato of village Tetangabad, P.O. Kari Tand, P.S. Putki, Dist. Dhanbad, whose land situated in Plot No. 673 of Mouza singda, was acquired by the management. In the course of verification of records it was detected that the concerned workman is the son of Hingu Mahato whose land had not been acquired by the management. A charge-sheet dated 25-2-88 was issued to him for giving false information regarding his father's name and entering in to the service of the management against the Scheme for employment of Land Looser indicating that his father's land was acquired by the management. The concerned workman submitted his reply dated 1-3-88 admitting that his father's name is Hingu Mahato. He stated that his father was having another name, Nakul Mahato and his father-in-law name is also Nakul Mehto. It has been submitted that the land of Nakul Mehto, the father-in-law of the concerned workman was acquired and to land of Hingu Mahato was acquired. The management appointed Sri S. Jha, Dy. Personnel Manager of Moonidih Project as Enquiry Officer and Sri R.K. Jha, the Personnel Officer as Presenting Officer by letter dated 30/31-3-88 for conducting departmental enquiry relating to the charge-sheet issued to the concerned workman. The departmental enquiry was fixed on number of dates and was conducted in presence of the concerned workman and his co-worker. The concerned workman was given full opportunity to cross-examine the management witnesses, to give his own statement and to produce his defence witness. The enquiry was conducted fairly and properly in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Enquiry Officer submitted his enquiry report dated 2-3-89 holding the concerned

workman guilty of the misconduct charged against him. The matter was examined by the General Manager/Chief Mining Engineer of Moonidih Area and approval for his dismissal was obtained from him. Thereafter he was dismissed from his service. It has been submitted that the very basis of his employment was based on false declaration and according to the terms of his service contained in his appointment letter and declaration, he was liable to be removed from his service in case any of his declaration would be found incorrect apart from being misconduct under the Certified Standing Order. Accordingly, he was dismissed from service.

It has been prayed by the management that the Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an award holding that the action of the management is legal and justified and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

In rejoinder to the written statement of the workman, the management has stated almost same things as have been stated in the written statement.

4. The concerned workman has filed rejoinder to the written statement of the management in which he has denied some contents made by the management in its written statement.

5. The enquiry was held to be fair and proper by this Tribunal vide order dated 24-12-94.

The management has examined Surendra Jha as MW-1. The documents filed by the management have been marked as Exts. M-1 to M-11 by waiving of formal proof.

6. The concerned workman has been dismissed from service on the ground that he has shown him in getting employment as son of Nakul Mahato, vill -Tatangabad, P.O. Karitand, Distt. Dhanbad on the ground that his land situated at plot No. 673 of Mouza Singda was acquired by the management. On verification of records it was detected that he is the son of Hingu Mahato whose land had not been acquired by the management. He was chargesheeted for giving false information regarding his parentage, though later on he admitted in his reply that his father's name is Hingu Mahato. He stated that his father was having another name Nakul Mahato. In this respect has given an affidavit.

7. It has been argued on behalf of the management that there is no impersonation regarding father's name but papers filed by the management, Ext. M-2 shows that Hingu Mahato has given his affidavit showing his alies name Nakul Mahato, resident of village-Tatangabad, P.S. Putki, Dist. Dhanbad. But as per affidavit given by the concerned workman on 23-3-87 shows that he has affirmed that Shyamlal Mahato S/o Nakul Mahato. He has not given any alias name of Hingu Mahato and has not given address Tatangabad, P.S. Putki, Dist. Dhanbad and Nakul Mahato has also given affidavit showing the concerned workman as his son, but he has not given any alias name of Hingu

Mahato. The paper filed by the concerned workman, Ext. M-9 shows that he has filed Mukhiya's certificate stating his father's name Hingu Mahato. There is no mention of alias name of Nakul Mahato as per affidavit given by Nakul Mahato dated 15-10-87. It shows that he is not resident of village- Tatangabad, P.S. Putki. The concerned workman, shyamlal Mahato, has given his father's name, Nakul Mahato, whom land has been acquired by the management to get employment.

8. Argument has been advanced on behalf of the workman that no second show cause notice has been given to him. But enquiry has been held fair and proper and the Enquiry Officer has recommended for dismissal of the concerned workman on the ground of getting employment on false ground. Another argument advised on behalf of the workman that Nakul Mahato had given information to the management that he has only dependent, the concerned workman and he should be given employment under land looser scheme. But this does not in any way help to the concerned workman because of the fact that he got employment under land looser scheme being the son of Nakul Mahato whose land was acquired by the management, but his father's name is Hingu Mahato whose land was not acquired by the management and Nakul Mahato is his father-in-law.

Considering the facts and circumstances, I hold that the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief.

9. Accordingly, I render the following award-The action of the management of Moonidih Project under M/s B.C.C.Ltd. in dismissing Shri Shyamlal Mahato, P.R. Mazdoor, Token No. 7305 under dismissal order No. MND/PO/Dismissal/39/89/997 dated 12/14-4-89 is justified and hence the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 179.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब एवं सिंधु बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, 1 चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 100/90) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/88/90-अई आर (बी-11)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th December, 2009

S.O. 179.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 100/90) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-I, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation

to the management of Punjab & Sind Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-12-2009.

[No. L-20012/88/90-IR B-II]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No:- ID No. 100/90

Shri Ajit Singh C/o Shri Tek Chand Sharma, 25, Sant Nagar,
Civil Lines, Ludhiana-141001.

... Applicant

Versus

The Personnel Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank, Head Office,
21, Rajendra Palace, New Delhi-110008.

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: Shri T.C. Sharma

For the management: Shri J.S. Sathi

AWARD

Passed on:- 7-12-09

This unfortunate reference is placed before me for award. The reference is unfortunate in the sense that it was received by this Tribunal in the year 1990 and was pending adjudication for long 19 years. Industrial Disputes Act, requires the adjudication of any reference within three months. That is the intention of the legislature too. If it is not possible for the Tribunal to answer the reference within three months, the same should be adjudicated within a reasonable time. 19 years at the initial stage, in any case, cannot be a reasonable time and in my view the parties have denied timely justice. Whatever may be the result of this reference, it may be answer in positive or in negative but it is a case of denying timely justice. For adjudication of the reference after abnormal delay of 19 years, as the Presiding Officer of this Court, I regret the parties on behalf of the Tribunal.

Government of India vide notification No. L-12012/88/90-IR (B-II), dated 3-6-90 referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication of this Tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Punjab and Sind Bank in terminating the services of Shri Ajit Singh, Clerk is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

After receiving the reference, parties were informed. They appeared and filed their respective pleadings. The workman in his pleadings has challenged enquiry, enquiry

proceedings, enquiry report and the proceedings before the disciplinary authority and appellate authority on the ground of violation of principle of natural justice. In so many garlanding words and in very lengthy statement of claim the workman has challenged the power of the Officer concern who has given the charge sheet to him, has appointed the enquiry officer and the powers of the enquiry officer to conduct the enquiry. The workman has also challenged the powers of the disciplinary authority and appellate authority. It is also challenged by the workman that without applying the mind enquiry officer has given the enquiry report and disciplinary authority has awarded the punishment. The appellate authority has summarily rejected the appeal without going through the materials on record.

On the other hand, the management of respondent bank has denied the allegations of the workman with the contention that on allegations of fraud and embezzlement of the public money from the bank, workman was charge sheeted thrice. A fair and proper enquiry was conducted. The workman was afforded the full opportunity of being heard. The enquiry officer has ensured the opportunity of hearing at every stage. The charge no. 1, was admitted by the workman. In spite of it, the charge No. 1, 2 & 3 were proved before the enquiry officer by independent evidence. No right of hearing was denied. Punishment awarded to the workman is proportionate to the committed misconduct. Appellate authority has also afforded the opportunity and applied his mind before disposing of the appeal.

Parties were afforded the opportunity for adducing evidence. Evidence was recorded. Entire enquiry file is on record. The opportunity for hearing was given to the parties. Parties argue the case orally and preferred to file the written arguments. I have gone through the written arguments of the parties as well.

After perusing the pleadings and evidence of the parties, I am of the view that following issues are to be answered/adjudicated by this Tribunal :—

- (1) Whether a fair and proper enquiry was conducted by the enquiry officer?
- (2) Whether enquiry officer has rightly reached to the conclusion for proving all the charges against the workman?
- (3) Whether disciplinary authority has complied with the principle of natural justice before awarding the punishment to the workman?
- (4) Whether the punishment awarded to the workman is proportionate to the committed misconduct.
- (5) Relief, if any.

First of all, it is made clear that workman was working as clerk at the time of the alleged misconduct. He was not

haging any supervisory or managerial power and any such function to discharge. Accordingly, this Tribunal has jurisdiction to answer this reference. The Manager concern who issues the charge sheet and suspended the workman was competent, as per the provisions of the bipartite settlement, applicable to the parties. Disciplinary authority has rightly appointed the enquiry officer as per the provision of the bipartite settlement and there seems to be no illegality in appointing the enquiry officer, issuing the charge sheet and conducting the enquiry.

The workman was charge sheeted on three counts for fraudulently withdrawn of public money from the saving bank account of different account holders.

After charge sheet, the workman was afforded the opportunity to reply the charge sheet. He replied the two charge sheets but not third one. Dissatisfying with the reply, the enquiry officer was ordered to be appointed. On transfer of the first enquiry officer, socond enquiry officer was appointed. The enquiry was conducted very slowly and the proceedings shows that enquiry officer was very liberal for adjourning the proceedings of the enquiry either at the request of the workman, his defence representative or the Presenting Officer of the bank. Apart from the adjournment sought the opportunity was given to the workman for appearing before the enquiry officer and to participate in the proceedings. There is no dispute for providing the copies of the documents relied by the management of the bank. In his oral cross-examination, Shri Ajit Singh has admitted that he was represented by the defence representative Shri S.K. Sharma through out the enquiry. Full opportunity for cross-examination of management witness was given to his defence representative. He was heard properly before given the enquiry report. The proceedings of enquiry also prove that enquiry was conducted as per the rules of the department. Adequate and proper opportunity of being heard was given to the workman and his defence representative.

Thus, I am of the view that enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner and there has been no violation of any rules of the principle of natural justice. Accordingly, the issue no. 1 is disposed off.

On issue no. 2, I am of the view that enquiry officer has rightly reached to the conclusion for proving all the charges against the workman. I am giving these findings on the basis of the followings :—

- (i) On Charge Sheet No. 1, dated 07-08-81, the enquiry officer has recorded the evidence of 8 management witnesses. It was the charge sheet regarding fraudulently withdrawal of Rs. 8,000 from the bank account of different persons, shown in the charge sheet. It is the case of the management that on applying mind by the person from whose saving bank A/c, the money was withdrawn, the then manager Shri Teja

Singh, MW8 conducted a preliminary enquiry. In his chamber, in presence of other bank employees, the workman admitted the withdrawal of amount and he also agreed to deposit Rs. 5,000 next day and rest Rs. 3,000 after sometime. The workman was also charge sheeted for making the fictitious entries to balance that amount, he fraudulently withdrew. It is true that the deposition of Rs. 5,000 by the workman has not been proved but it is proved that Rs. 5,000/- was deposited by some person known to the workman. Admission made before Shri Teja Singh, M8 is proved before the enquiry officer. Rest of the witnesses also proved the fictitious entries and fraudulently withdrawal from the saving bank account of four persons namely Shri Shangara Singh, S. Hazoor Singh, S. Hazoor Singh, Shangara Singh, Hazoor Singh, Jitinder Kaur, Gurdiattar Singh, Smt. Pritam Kaur. The admission of the workman is well proved. It is also proved that in consequent to the admission Rs. 5,000 was deposited in the bank.

The proceedings before this Tribunal are altogether different then the proceedings before the Civil Courts. The charge against the workman, before the Tribunal and in the departmental proceedings has to be proved on the basis of the equity, justice and good conscious. The provisions of Indian Evidence Act have no application. Any statement and evidence which has credibility and nexus with the commission of the act said to be misconduct can be relied upon even though the Indian Evidence Act, might have not permitted. The workman admitted before MW8. I have gone through the, statement of PW8 and other witnesses recorded by the enquiry officer. This charge is proved beyond shadow of doubt. The act of admission coupled with the deposition of Rs. 5,000 is proved by the statement of witnesses. The fabrication of documents is also proved before the enquiry officer. Thus, there is no occasion for me to interfere in the findings of the enquiry officer made on charge no. 1. I am of the view that enquiry officer has rightly given the finding on this charge sheet.

- (ii) Charge No. 2, dated 20-10-81 is also relating to the fraudulently withdrawn an amount of Rs. 20,000 and Rs. 1,000 on 20.01.81 and 19-02-81 from Saving Bank Account No. 2417 in the name of Shri Hira Singh who died on 07-05-80. The enquiry officer elaborately

recorded the statement of six witnesses. Opportunity for cross-examination was given to the workman. I have gone through the statement of all the witnesses MW1 to MW6 recorded by the enquiry officer during enquiry. Proper opportunity for cross-examination was given to the workman and his defence representative. In this charge, how he withdrew the amount, fabricated the documents and occasion to do it, is established by the witnesses. I have gone through the enquiry report and its proceedings. I am of the view that enquiry officer has rightly given the finding on Charge No. 2 to be well proved and there is no occasion for me for any inference in the decision making of the enquiry officer on Charge No. 2 as well.

- (iii) Charge Sheet No. 3, dated 25-05-83 is also relating to the fraudulently withdrawal of amount of Rs. 2,000/- with forged signatures of Shri Sohan Singh, from Saving Bank Account No. 793 and fabrication of documents to balance the fabricated amount. Likewise, in this charge sheet he was also charged for fraudulently withdrawal the amount of Rs. 3000 from Account No. 790 of S. Sohan Singh on 01-09-90 and fabrication of document to make the balance good in the official records of the bank. As more as, statement of 8 witnesses were recorded for this charge. For Head No. 1 of this charge, the withdrawal form was also misplaced, whereas, on Head No. 2 the withdrawal forms were available. The statement of daftri MW1 shows that workman use to visit to the place where the withdrawal forms were kept. He suspected the workman Shri Ajit Singh to misplace the withdrawal forms, no doubt, he has not seen him. The cause for doubt which MW1 shows was that in another case the workman Shri Ajit Singh has deposited Rs. 5,000/- . In my view this cannot be a cause for doubting the workman Shri Ajit Singh for misplacing the withdrawal form. Nobody has seen him misplacing the withdrawal form from the office and the only evidence available is that PW1 is doubting the workman for misplacing the withdrawal form on the ground that he has deposited Rs. 5,000 in another case which he has fraudulently withdrew. It cannot be a good cause for holding the guilty of the workman for misplacing the withdrawal form.

But fraudulently withdrawing the amount and opportunity and occasion for withdrawing the amount was proved by rest of the witnesses. It was also proved that withdrawal form was

not signed by the then Manager but Shri Ajit Singh himself to get the withdrawal form signed and passed under the forged signature. After going through the entire evidence of witnesses and perusing the documentary evidence, I am of the view that enquiry officer has rightly held the Charge No. 3 well proved against the workman except the charge of misplacing the withdrawal form of Rs. 2,000.

Thus, on the basis of the above observation, I am of the view that enquiry officer has not only conducted the enquiry in a fair and proper manner but he has rightly given his findings on all the charges being proved against the workman. On perusal of proceedings, I am of the view that disciplinary authority has afforded the opportunity of being heard to the workman. In his oral cross-examination, the workman has admitted that show cause notice was given to him and he was heard by the disciplinary authority. There is no dispute that copy of the enquiry report was not given to him. Accordingly, the disciplinary authority has conducted the disciplinary proceedings as per the rules of the department and there has been no violation of the principle of natural justice by the disciplinary authority as well. Show cause notice with purposed punishment was given. Workman was heard properly before awarding the punishment. Workman preferred an appeal which was dismissed after considering all the facts and circumstance of the case by the appellat authority. Accordingly, Issues No. 2 and 3 are answered.

The charges proved against the workman are fraudulently withdrawn of public money from the account of certain account holders. Whatever may be amount there should be no lineancy for this type of misconduct. Integrity and honesty of the person is inherent in the institutions like bank where the only business is flow of public money. By the acts which are proved to be the misconduct of the workman, certainly not only the confidence of the public in the financial institution is at a stake but the institution also lost the faith in the workman. Thus, the punishment of termination of the workman from the services is proportionate to the committed misconduct and there is no occasion for this Tribunal to interfere in the punishment awarded by the disciplinary authority to the workman. Accordingly Issue No. 4 is answered.

On relief clause, I am of the view that on the basis of the discussion and the decisions taken by this Tribunal on Issue No. 1, 2, 3 & 4 the workman is not entitled for any relief.

The reference is accordingly answered. Let Ce. Government be informed for publication of award, and thereafter, file be consigned to record room.

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 180.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सिंडिकेट बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय एरनाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 112/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-12-06 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/256/2002-आई आर (बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th December, 2009

S. O. 180.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 112/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ernakulam now as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Syndicate Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-12-09.

[No. L-12011/256/2002-IR (B-II)]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
ERNAKULAM.**

Present: Shri P. L. Norbert, B.A., LL.B., Presiding Officer
(Thursday the 26th day of February, 2009/7th Phalgun,
1930)

I. D. 112/2006

(I.D. 31/2003 of Labour Court, Ernakulam)

Union : The General Secretary,
Syndicate Bank Staff Union,
Shanthi Theatre Annexe,
44, Mount Road, Chennai-600 002.

By Adv. Shri Davis P. I.

Management : The Deputy General Manager,
Syndicate Bank,
Sasthakripa, Office Complex,
Sasthamangalam, Trivandrum-695 010
By Adv. Shri M.P. Ashok Kumar.

This case coming up for hearing on 26-02-2009, this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on the same day passed the following.

AWARD

This is a reference made under Section 10 (1)(d) of Industrial Disputes Act challenging the findings in the domestic enquiry and the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority.

2. When the matter came up for evidence the union raised a preliminary objection regarding validity of enquiry. That aspect was considered as a preliminary issue and it was found by order dated 21-10-2008 that the enquiry is vitiated for violation of the principles of natural justice. Since the enquiry was set aside the case was posted for fresh evidence for the purpose of proving the charges. But despite several adjournments at the instance of Management they have not adduced any evidence. Today the management and counsel are absent. There is not even a representation for them. This is a reference made in 2003. There is no meaning in keeping the case pending indefinitely. Since there is no material on record to prove the charges, the punishment also cannot stand. Both findings and punishment are liable to be set aside.

In the result an award is passed finding that the action of the management in termination the service of workman Shri Salim Rajkumar is illegal and unjustified and he is entitled to be reinstated with all consequential benefits from the date of termination.

The award will come into force one month after its publication in the Official Gazette.

Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 26th day of February, 2009.

P. L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer

Appendix—Nil

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 181.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 40/2009) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/21/2009-आई आर (बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th December, 2009

S. O. 181.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 40/2009) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the annexure in the

Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Indian Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-12-09.

[No. L-12011/21/2009-IR(B-II)]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Monday, the 8th December, 2009

Present : Shri A. N. Janardanan, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 40/2009

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Indian Bank and their Workman]

BETWEEN

The General Secretary : I Party/Petitioner
Indian Bank Employees Union,
No. 6, Moore Street, Mannady Corner,
Chennai-600001

Vs.

The General Manager : 2nd Party/Respondent
Indian Bank Head Office
66, Rajaji Salai
Chennai-600001

APPEARANCE

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : Shri J. Thomas
Jeyaprabhakaran

For the 2nd Party/Management : Ms. Cynthia
Yvonne Noronha

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12011/21/2009-IR(B-II) dated 20-5-2009 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

The schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the action of the management of Indian Bank in reducing the pay of Sri V. Vijayakumar, Clerk/Shroff, Alwarpet Branch, Chennai by one stage for a period of two years with cumulative effect as punishment, is legal, fair and justified? What relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 40/2009 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearing through their

advocates and filed their Claim, Counter and Rejoinder Statements as the case may be.

3. The case of the petitioner in the Claim Statement briefly reads as follows :

V. Vijaykumar, Clerk at the Alwarpet branch of the Respondent/Bank was alleged of having had executed a guarantee agreement in favour of Bank of Baroda for housing loan of one V.R. Rajan. He tendered his salary slip for November, 2003 with copy of the bank's ID Card, Rajan did not repay the monthly dues promptly, Bank of Baroda reported to the Indian Bank and requesting to procure assistance of Vijaykumar. Salary details and salary slip were found forged and manipulated. The employee had not received salary for that month. In the reply of the employee dated 22-4-2006 he stated that he never submitted any salary details and that everything respecting him is forged and at the request of a known person he consented to be a guarantor for Rajan. The employee was accordingly charged for making false statement, doing act prejudicial to the interests of the bank and incurring excessive debts under minor misconduct while the former two are under gross misconducts. The forgery is by someone on the back of the employee. In the enquiry held, originals of the documents or the official concerned were not produced. The charge of excessive borrowing was held proved. The punishment imposed is harsh. The conclusion of the Enquiry Officer is subjective. The employee who acted in good faith cannot be faulted with for some misdeeds done behind his back. Even if the employee is to be punished, it is to be only under minor misconduct. The punishment is disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct and is unjust and illegal. For the minor misconduct of incurring excessive borrowings if at all proved, he is only liable to be warned or censured or adversely remarked against or his increment stopped not exceeding 6 months. The evidence may be reappreciated and it may be found that no major misconducts are proved and the same may be set aside.

4. In the Counter Statement, the contentions raised briefly read as follows :

High sense of honesty and integrity is excepted from the petitioner as bank staff. The pay-slip furnished by the workman to Bank of Baroda was manipulated inflating his salary and signature in the pay-slip was forging that of the Manager of Kodambakkam branch at that time. The concerned workman had not drawn any salary from August 2003 to March 2004. The pay-slip bears the date as 28-11-2003. The salary for November 2003 of the branch was paid on 27-1-2003. The reply of the

employee as to this dated 22-4-2006 was evasive and pre-varicating. The order of punishment is fully justified and valid. Section-11A of the ID Act would not apply. On any ground the punishment is not bad in law and is not liable to be interfered with. That the fraud was committed behind the back of the workman is totally unacceptable. The claim may be dismissed.

5. In the Rejoinder Statement over and above the already reserved contentions in the claim statement, the further contentions raised are as follows :

Documents had been forged at his back by the borrower colluding with Bank of Baroda. The workman was bent on criminal proceeding against them. Bank of Baroda did not verify the workman's credentials with the Respondent/Bank before sanctioning the loan. The Enquiry Officer rightly found absence of proof that salary slip was signed by him. For fabrication at the back of workman, he is not to be held liable.

6. The evidence consists of Ex. W1 to Ex. W21 on the petitioner's side and Ex. M1 to Ex. M3 on the side of the Respondent, all marked on consent. No oral evidence was adduced on either side.

7. Points for consideration are :

- (i) Whether the reduction of pay of the workman by one stage for a period of two years with cumulative effect is legal, fair and justified?
- (ii) To what relief the concerned workman is entitled?

Point Nos. 1 and 2

8. Heard both sides. Pursued the enquiry proceedings and the report. The challenge is predominantly against the quantum of punishment. The enquiry is not virtually assailed. The conclusion of the Enquiry Officer is attacked as being subjective. The petitioner seeks re-appraisal of the evidence and reduction of the punishment as one for minor misconduct for incurring excessive borrowings if at all proved and setting aside the punishment for the so-called major misconduct of alleged making of false statements and doing act prejudicial to the interests of the bank. The Respondent points out that Section-11A of the ID Act is not applicable because the punishment herein is not one of dismissal, removal or discharge from service. The case of the petitioner that the fraud was committed behind the back of the workman is not at all approvable, Respondent contents. No oral evidence has been adduced on either side. The documents on either side have also been marked on consent.

9. Now the question is whether the petitioner is not responsible for the fraud committed. According to the petitioner, he just gave a consent to be a guarantor for a loan for V.R. Rajan. Further according to him he acted in

good faith and cannot be faulted with for some misdeeds done behind his back. The charge is that the workman fabricated false statement and forged signature in salary slips. True in the enquiry it is found that there is absence of proof that salary slip was signed by the workman. At this juncture it is pertinent to consider the absence of proof of the workman having signed the salary slip, per se is a circumstance to take away his liability of being a fraudster or at least a conniver for the false statements and for the other charge against him. The case of the petitioner is that he was just giving a consent to be a guarantor for Rajan at the request of some known person who was a tuition master of his son. This is a crucial circumstance from which it has to be judged whether the workman has or has not been responsible for the false statements, forgery and the fraud by himself being the perpetrator of the said acts or at least by conniving for the commission of the same. The fact that he consented to be a guarantor for V.R. Rajan is admitted by him. It is also admitted that he had disclosed his salary details and address details for the transaction. To prove the direct involvement of the workman, there is no evidence. But the fact that the workman while was expressing consent to be a guarantor for a third person not known to him to incur a huge loan of Rs. 16,00,000 through some persons known to him was not diligent enough in the said transaction is discernibly a matter against normal course of natural events and normal course of human conduct. The petitioner, if he himself has not had been a party to the forging of signature that per se does not mean that he could not have connived in bringing about it in order to obtain a loan for the borrower. Here the relevant consideration is whether the workman has not had the intention of colluding with the borrower to accomplish the purpose of obtaining the loan, with or without some economic advantage for him over the said transaction. While it is against human conduct to consent to be a guarantor to an unknown person through some so-called known persons, the manner in which the workman explains away his unbelievable conduct, has to be taken as a circumstance to hold whether he is or not responsible for the forgery and fraud practiced for obtaining the loan. The fact is logically probative to a prudent mind to hold that without the involvement and connivance from the workman, the manipulation could not have been brought about. The emerging facts are capable of being perceived by the senses and they constitute a relevant fact, if not a fact in issue and the same is logically probative so as to cogently lead to a conclusion that without the involvement or connivance of the workman the manipulation leading to the procurement of the loan by the borrower could not have been brought about. Hence he cannot disown responsibility. This act of the workman therefore amounts to making false statements, doing acts prejudicial to the interests of the bank and incurring excessive debts charged against him. The finding of the Enquiry Officer being the same, it is only legal, fair and justified and the same does not call for interference, The petitioner is therefore not entitled to any relief.

10. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the PA, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 8th December, 2009)

A. N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:—

For the I Party/Petitioner : None

For the II Party/Petitioner : None

Documents Marked:**On the Petitioner's side**

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.W1	13-03-2006	Show Cause Notice Ref: COCH: IRC: CSR: 24969/2006/2 dated 13-03-2006 issued to Shri V. Vijayakumar
Ex.W2	22-04-2006	Shri V. Vijayakumar's reply to the General Manager's Show Cause Notice dated 13-03-2006
Ex.W3	01-11-2006	Letter Ref: CO:CH:VIG:V579 dated 01-11-2006 of General Manager / Disciplinary Authority appointing the Enquiry Officer and Presenting Officer enclosing the list of documentary exhibits.
Ex.W4	20-12-2006	Enquiry proceedings held on 20-12-2006, 19-01-2007, 22-02-2007, 14-03-2007 and 10-04-2007 conducted by Mr. M. Harihara Subramanian, Manager, Circle Officer, Chennai
Ex.W5	24-01-2006	Letter Ref: PBBANN/8 dated 24-01-2006 received from Bank of Baroda
Ex.W6	07-02-2006	Letter Ref: PBBANN/Adv./7/174 received from Bank of Baroda
Ex.W7	21-02-2007	Letter Ref: PBBANN/AD 592 received from Bank of Baroda
Ex.W8	24-12-2003	Bank of Baroda form No. F No. 135-Application by Guarantor for advances
Ex.W9		Postal acknowledgement card addressed to Sri V. Vijayakumar
Ex.W10	24-12-2003	Bank of Baroda general form of guarantee dated 24-12-2003
Ex.W11		Presenting Officer's brief in the enquiry held against Sri V. Vijayakumar

Ex.W12	05-06-2007	Defence summing up in the enquiry held against Shri V. Vijayakumar
Ex.W13	23-06-2007	Letter Ref: COCH:VIG:V:579 from Chief Manager, Circle Officer, Chennai enclosing the copy of the Enquiry Officer's findings dated 21-06-2007
Ex.W14	28-06-2007	Sri V. Vijayakumar's comments on the findings of the Enquiry Officer
Ex.W15	26-07-2007	Show Cause Ref: COCH:VIG:V:579 by the Disciplinary Authority proposing the punishment of Reduction of pay by one stage for a period of two years with cumulative effect.
Ex.W16	06-08-2007	Sri V. Vijayakumar's reply to the Show Cause dated 26-07-2007
Ex.W17	08-08-2007	Letter Ref: COCH:VIG:V:579 by the Disciplinary Authority imposing the proposed punishment
Ex.W18	13-09-2007	Appeal submitted by Sri V. Vijayakumar to the General Manager (PS) / Appellate Authority
Ex.W19	29-01-2008	Order of the General Manager / Appellate Authority rejecting the appeal vide Ref: HRM:DPC:060:2008
Ex.W20	19-04-2008	Industrial Dispute raised by the IBEU before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Chennai vide Ref: IBEU/808/2004-2006
Ex.W21	02-09-2008	Rejoinder submitted by the Union vide Ref: IBEU/891/2004-2006

On the Management's side

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.M1	21-02-2003	Punishment order for excessive borrowing and unauthorized absence
Ex.M2	09-02-2005	Punishment order for excessive borrowings and unauthorized absence
Ex.M3	22-04-2006	Reply submitted by the petitioner to the subject matter charge sheet dated 13-03-2006

नई दिल्ली, 22 दिसम्बर, 2009

AWARD

का. आ. 182.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 79/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/93/2007-आई आर (बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 2009

S. O. 182.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 79/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Chennai now as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-12-09.

[No. L-12012/93/2007-IR (B-II)]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Tuesday, the 15th December, 2009

Present : Shri A. N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 79/2007

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Indian Bank and their Workman)

BETWEEN

Sri J. Jacob Selvam : 1 Party/Petitioner

Vs.

The General Manager : 2nd Party/Respondent
Indian Bank
Personnel Department
Head Office
66 Rajaji Salai
Chennai-600001

APPEARANCE

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : Shri J. Vaidyanathan

For the 2nd Party/Management : M/s. T.S. Gopalan & Co.

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/93/2007-IR(B-II) dated 28-11-2007 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the action of the management of Indian Bank in imposing the punishment of “dismissal without notice” on Sri J. Jacob Selvam is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as I D 79/2007 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their advocates and filed their Claim Statement and Counter Statements as the case may be.

3. The case in the Claim Statement briefly is as follows:

The petitioner while was Clerk/Shroff at Egmore branch of the Respondent/Bank was suspended on 25-07-2002 for alleged misappropriation. On 29-11-2002 show cause notice was issued alleging fraudulent withdrawals, fraudulent authorization of vouchers, signing of pay-in-slip as a customer, etc. pertaining to 8 different transactions. In spite of his repeated letters asking time for furnishing detailed explanation, declining to grant time, the enquiry was ordered commencing from 05-05-2003 to 16-07-2003 which was concluded within 2 months. Charges 1 to 5 were held proved. Ignoring his submission on the report, Disciplinary Authority concurred with the finding and confirmed the proposed punishment of dismissal on 27-03-2004. Appeal preferred was dismissed on 22-02-2005. The Enquiry Report was based on his letters dated 24-07-2002 and 25-07-2002 treating them as confession in disregard of the fact that the confession was under compulsion and letters of admissions were obtained under duress. The report is perverse which is not based on evidence. It is against the admission of MW1 Investigating Officer that he had written the letter who also deposed that petitioner had not accepted the admission. Even a single witness among the 12 witnesses has not pinpointed him as involved in the transactions. The evidence in favour of the petitioner was not taken into account by the Enquiry Officer. The enquiry is not fair or proper and is against the principles of natural justice. The Enquiry Officer acted on surmises and conjectures. The enquiry is sham. There is no application of mind. The appeal order is not a speaking one. The punishment is not commensurate to the gravity of the alleged misconduct. Hence the prayer.

4. The contentions raised in the Counter Statement briefly read as follows:

One M. Abdul Wahab having NRE SB A/c No. 12034 died on 24-01-1986 leaving a balance of Rs. 5,75,380.95 as on 02-02-2002. His another account no. NRI/RIP for Rs. 24,95,500 had matured on 04-04-1988. On a claim of the amount by the legal heirs when verified the SB NRE Account No. 12034, it was found that fraudulent withdrawals were made leaving a balance on 22-07-2002 to be only Rs. 550.70 instead of Rs. 5,75,380.95 which account had remained inoperative for a long period. On a probe it transpired that on 13-03-2002 the seen credit of Rs. 476 was made to make. It appear that it was an operative account. In March 2002, the name of SB A/c holder was altered from M. Abdul Wahab to M. Jagannathan in the computer through Customer Master Modification and new signature was scanned through the computer on 16-03-2002. By means of cheque leaves, amounts were withdrawn on 17-03-2002, 26-03-2002, 28-03-2002, 3-04-2002, 10-04-2002 and 03-05-2002. A Cheque Book with 20 leaves was found entered in Cheque Book Register on 14-03-2002. The first cheque for Rs. 1,310.25 was drawn in favour of Standard Chartered Bank Card and other cheques in favour of M.D. Mohammad and last cheque presented on 03-05-2002 was in favour of Rajan. On investigation by Senior Manager, the cheques were found drawn by a single person. The petitioner admitted to have had debited the cheques in Abdul Salam Node when Abdul Salam was not there in his Node. He also admitted having had written the token numbers on all the instruments. On 24-07-2002, he admitted guilt and also gave a letter giving details of the withdrawals. He remitted Rs. 20,000 on 25-07-2002 and assured to pay the balance. His wife Jasmine and Brother-in-Law B. Jebaraj Mahildas who were present signed as witnesses other than Abdul Salam, Felix David, Staff Members. By 02-08-2002, the petitioner made good the entire money with a request for correct appropriation. He was charge sheeted on 29-11-2002. In his reply dated 29-01-2003, he replied that he was made a scapegoat. Enquiry was held in which he participated. The letters given by him were not under coercion. The confession was voluntary and genuine. The petitioner not only admitted the unauthorized withdrawals but also disclosed how he spent the money. Now his attempt is to wriggle out of the confession statement and its consequences. The claim is to be dismissed.

5. The evidence consists of Ex.W1 to Ex.W35 on the petitioner's side and Ex.M1 to Ex.M50 on the side of the Respondent, all marked on consent. No oral evidence was adduced on either side.

Points for consideration are:

- (i) Whether the dismissal of the petitioner is legal and justified?
- (ii) To what relief the concerned workman is entitled?

Points 1 & 2

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner was forced to admit the misconduct of a certain misappropriation of money whereupon his father-in-law was paying the money in instalments. This has led the Management to perceive misconduct against the petitioner. He continued to argue that payment of money or the mere admission of the misconduct cannot ipso facto be taken as proved misconduct. Before the commencement of enquiry there was confession of the guilt by the petitioner. During the enquiry the liability was disputed. He would further argue that admission of guilt prior to enquiry is not to be decisive to find the petitioner guilty. He continued to contend that under bipartite-settlement extenuating circumstances could have been taken into account by the bank and to have had avoided capital punishment in view of the fact that Section-11A of the I. D. Act is not to become redundant. He would again point out that during the enquiry the petitioner did not admit the guilt. He invited this Court's attention to the ruling reported in CORK INDUSTRIES, MADRAS AND FIRST ADDITIONAL LABOUR COURT & ANOTHER (1991-1-LLN-817) wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Madras held that "Labour Court though held that enquiry against the workman was valid and proper held that charge against workman was not satisfactorily proved and hence directed his reinstatement with full backwages - On a writ petition, High Court, held that award of Labour Court cannot be interfered with and that Labour Court under S.11A of Industrial Disputes Act is clothed with such power". The same Court in the decision in S.K. RAMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF KUNDAH RURAL COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY LTD. REPRESENTED BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER & ANOTHER (1987-1-LLJ-487) held that "whether the employee admits the misconduct or not, the employer must conduct an enquiry to substantiate the misconduct on the basis of which employer dispenses with the services of the employee, and in the absence of such an enquiry, the order of dismissal, would be invalid". In THE MANAGEMENT OF SHOLAYAR ESTATE VS. THE PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, COIMBATORE & ANOTHER (1999-1-CTC-608), Hon'ble High Court of Madras held that "he has further observed that the Labour court has failed to take into account all the relevant, facts and mitigating circumstances in favour of the petitioner when considering the question whether the quantum of punishment was proportionate to the misconduct and whether the petitioner deserved a lenient punishment and hence remitted the matter to reconsider the entire matter afresh and award suitable punishment". In the case of THE MANAGEMENT OF ASIA TOBACCO CO. LTD. VS. THE PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, VELLORE-5

(2006-2-CTC-470) the High Court of Madras held that "it is well established principle in law that in a given circumstance it is open to the Industrial Tribunal acting under Section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has the jurisdiction to interfere with the punishment awarded in the domestic enquiry for good and valid reasons".

7 The arguments on behalf of the Respondent are that in Ex.M 16-Confession Statement apart from Ex.M1 the petitioner has confessed his misconduct and has admittedly signed it. In this case apart from confession of guilt there has been repayment of the misappropriated money on behalf of the petitioner. That the admission was the outcome of coercion upon the petitioner is not true. With clean past records, there is no scope for Interference. This is not a case where the Court has to be mis-carried by sympathy, it being a case of misappropriation? If money defrauding the bank in which the petitioner was employed. The learned counsel for the Respondent relied on the decision of the Supreme Court in COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, NEW DELHI AND NARENDER SINGH (2006-3-LLN-1 04) wherein the Apex Court held that "the scope of Art. 226 in dealing with departmental inquiries has come up before this court. Two propositions were laid down by this Court in State of Andhra Pradesh Vs. Sree Rama Rao [A.I. R. 1963 S. C 1723]. First, there is no warrant for the view that in considering whether a public officer guilty of misconduct charged against him, the rule followed in criminal trials that an offence is not established unless proved by evidence beyond reasonable doubt to the satisfaction of the Court must be applied. If that rule be not applied by a domestic tribunal of enquiry the High Court in a petition under Art. 226 of the Constitution is not competent to declare the order of the authorities holding a departmental enquiry invalid. The High Court is not a Court of appeal under Art. 226 over the decision of the authorities holding a departmental enquiry against a public servant. The Court is concerned to determine whether the enquiry is held by an authority competent in that behalf and according to the procedure prescribed in that behalf, and whether the rules of natural justice are not violated. Second, where there is some evidence which the authority entrusted with the duty to hold the enquiry has accepted and which evidence may reasonably support the conclusion that the delinquent officer is guilty of the charge, it is not the function of the High Court to review the evidence and to arrive at an independent finding on the evidence. The High Court may interfere where the departmental authorities have held the proceedings against the delinquent in a manner inconsistent with the rules of natural justice or in violation of the statutory rules prescribing the mode of enquiry or where the authorities have disabled themselves from reaching a fair decision by some considerations extraneous to the evidence and the merits of the case or by allowing themselves to be influenced by irrelevant considerations or where the conclusion on the very face of it also wholly arbitrary and capricious that no reasonable person could ever have

arrived at that conclusion. The departmental authorities are, if the enquiry is otherwise properly held, the sole judges of facts and if there is some legal evidence on which their findings can be based, the adequacy or reliability of that evidence is not a matter which can be permitted to be canvassed before the High Court in proceeding for a writ under Art. 226" In KULDEEP SINGH VS. STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS (1996-10-SCC-665), the Apex Court held that "strict rules of Evidence Act are not applicable in departmental enquiry. The only thing is that evidence must be relevant. How it was obtained is immaterial". In THE MANAGEMENT OF CATHOLIC SYRIAN BANK LTD. AND INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS (1999-2-LLJ-194), the High Court of Madras held that "the past conduct of the employee viz. that he has not suffered any penalty earlier is not by itself sufficient to hold that the Order of dismissal should not have been passed. Reference to the past record of service in the Bipartite Settlement is not meant to a trap to render ineffective, order of termination passed as a consequence of grave misconduct having been proved".

8. The learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that the fraud or confession made in this case is not disputed. The petitioner has not come forward to give any evidence in contra. He was satisfied with the enquiry. The payment coupled with confession would amount to confession of guilt. There is also evidence adduced elaborately against the petitioner. The charges are serious and past record of service is immaterial. There is no scope for interference with the findings or on the punishment under Section-11A of the I.D. Act.

9. On a consideration of the rival contentions, I am led to the conclusion that this is a case in which the petitioner is not entitled to the relief of exoneration from the guilt. The fact of initial confession though retracted at the stage of enquiry, coupled with the repayment of misappropriated amounts is discernibly a material logically probative to a prudent mind to hold the petitioner guilty. In industrial adjudication, the same degree of proof rendering preponderance of probabilities is adequate to warrant such a finding. But regarding the punishment lofty and idealistic notions of real justice persuade me to think that the petitioner ought to have been visited with a lesser punishment than the one imposed. In this case the petitioner initially confessed the guilt though he retracted from it at the stage of enquiry. Having regard to the common course of human conduct and natural events I am emboldened to presume lawfully that too statutorily that the petitioner initially confessed guilt which he later retracted at the enquiry stage only for the reason that he had the legitimate expectation of his not being terminated from service once he confessed the misconduct and made good the loss but for which he might not have made the confession. But the fact which turned out otherwise by way of his termination is really shocking to him, not only to him but also to many other persons truly not interested in him in the given circumstances of the confession made by

him. It is also worthy to note that but for the confession made by the petitioner there could hardly be any evidence of preponderating nature adduced in the enquiry held against him. So viewed, there is a betrayal of confidence as against the legitimate expectation of the petitioner since the capital punishment of dismissal from service was against his contemplation of some benign consideration of a favour with regard to the punishment emanating from his employer. Discernibly, the enquiry cannot be found to have gone much against him with nobody pinpointing him as the sole fraudster. Therefore, the only logically probative material leading to be finding as to be being the guilty is confession alone. Hence the petitioner ought to have been given a sanction with some lesser punishment in the interest of justice. Under Section-11A of the ID Act, as cited in the decisions supra, this Tribunal is clothed with authority to alter or reduce the punishment appropriately for various valid and good reasons other than the disproportionate nature of punishment to the gravity of the misconduct. There is nothing bad in his past record of service. Though that, per se, is not a ground to award a lesser punishment than the one proposed the same fact cumulatively reckoned with other facts and circumstances discussed by me above, I am of the well considered view that the petitioner's punishment needs to be suitably reduced by replacing the punishment of dismissal with discharge keeping in view of the fact that by doing so the petitioner may well become entitled to terminal benefits, if applicable, which he would not receive otherwise.

10. The charges against the petitioner stand well establishment but the punishment is liable to be interfered with in the light of my foregoing discussion. The action of the Management is not a legal and justified to the extent as above.

11. Resultantly, the dismissal is set aside. The Respondent is directed to convert the punishment of dismissal from service to discharge thereby allow him to receive the consequential service benefits and the like that might accrue or might have accrued to his credit.

12. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the PA, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this day the 15th December, 2008).

A.N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

For the I Party/Petitioner : None
For the II Party/Respondent : None

Documents Marked :—

On the Petitioner's Side :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
(1)	(2)	(3)
Ex. W1	-	Names of staff who had debited, passed and paid the instruments (Computer Screening slips).

(1)	(2)	(3)
Ex. W2	10-4-02	Node allotted to the petitioner.
Ex. W3	10-4-02	Node allotted to Abdul Salam .
Ex. W4	—	Thasildar Certificate.
Ex. W5	—	Sports Certificate of the Petitioner.
Ex. W6	25-07-2002	Suspension order.
Ex. W7	29-11-02	Show cause notice.
Ex. W8	22-12-02	Representation of the petitioner.
Ex. W9	29-1-2003	Representation of the petitioner.
Ex. W10	25-02-2003	Representation of the petitioner.
Ex. W11	24-04-2003	Representation of the petitioner.
Ex. W12	05-05-2003	Enquiry proceedings.
Ex. W13	18-06-2003	Enquiry proceedings.
Ex. W14	15-07-2003	Enquiry proceedings.
Ex. W15	16-07-2003	Enquiry proceedings.
Ex. W16	06-11-2003	Respondent's letter to the petitioner with Enquiry Report.
Ex. W17	06-12-2003	Reply to the petitioner on the enquiry report.
Ex. W18	27-03-2004	Letter of the Respondent imposing punishment.
Ex. W19	18-03-2004	Petitioner's reply to Show Cause notice in Tamil.
Ex. W20	18-03-2004	Petitioner's reply to Show Cause notice in English.
Ex. W21	10-05-2004	Representation of the petitioner in English.
Ex. W22	02-05-2004	Appeal to the Appellate Authority in English.
Ex. W23	13-03-2003	Charge Sheet.
Ex. W24	10-05-2003	Representation of the petitioner to the Bank.
Ex. W25	26-08-2003	Enquiry Officer's Report.
Ex. W26	26-09-2003	Defence Summing up.
Ex. W27	16-02-2004	Show Cause Notice proposing the punishment.
Ex. W28	02-05-2004	Appeal to the Appellate Authority.
Ex. W29	23-02-2005	Order of the Appellate Authority.
Ex. W30	12-03-2002	Pay in slip for USD-10.
Ex. W31	13-03-2002	F.B.P. Debit Voucher.
Ex. W32	13-03-2002	Credit Voucher
Ex. W33	31-03-2002	Cheque No. 331822.
Ex. W34	9-04-2002	Cheque No. 331831.
Ex. W35	9-04-2002	Cheque No. 331832.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
On the Management's side :			Ex.M25	—	Manual ledger extract of SB/NRE A/c No. 12034 (ME. 64).
Ex.M1	24-07-2002	Letter by petitioner to the respondent.	Ex.M26	11/13-02-03	Letter from Vigilance Department of Respondent Bank to petitioner.
Ex.M2	23-07-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the AGM Circle Office (ME 1).	Ex.M27	27-07-2002	Debit Voucher for Rs. 30,000.
Ex.M3	25-07-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the AGM Circle Office (ME 2).	EX.M28	26-07-2002	MT No. 448017 for Rs. 30,000 from Pallavaram branch and Scribling Sheet regarding MT No. 448017.
Ex.M4	25-07-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the AGM Circle Office (ME 3).	Ex.M29	27-07-2002	Credit voucher for Rs. 30,000.
Ex.M5	30-07-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the AGM Circle Office (ME 5).	EX.M30	28-07-2002	Credit Voucher for Rs. 50,000.
Ex.M6	31-07-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the AGM Circle Office (ME 6).	EX.M31	30-07-2002	Credit Voucher for Rs. 5,000.
Ex.M7	02-08-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the AGM Circle Office (ME 7).	Ex.M32	26-07-2002	Xerox copy of Canara Bank Demand Draft for Rs. 5,000.
Ex.M8	06-08-2002	Letter by Egmore branch to the petitioner (ME 8).	EX.M33	30-07-2002	Credit Voucher for Rs. 75,000.
Ex.M9	31-12-2002	Letter by circle office to the petitioner (ME 10).	EX.M34	29-07-2002	Letter from Mr. D. David John to the Manager, Indian Bank, Egmore.
Ex.M10	17-03-2002	Cheque No. 331821 (ME. 13).	Ex.M35	31-08-2002	Cash Voucher for Rs. 98,000.
Ex.M11	17-03-2002	Cheque No. 331824 (ME. 14).	Ex.M36	01-08-2002	Cash Voucher for Rs. 98,000.
Ex.M12	26-03-2002	Cheque No. 331825 (ME. 15).	Ex.M37	31-07-2002	Letter from D. David John to Chief Manager, Indian Bank, Egmore with courier cover.
Ex.M13	28-03-2002	Cheque No. 331830 (ME. 16).	Ex.M38	—	Xerox copy of Central Bank of India Demand Draft for Rs. 47,000.
Ex.M14	03-05-2002	Cheque No. 331835 (ME. 20).			Xerox copy of Central Bank of India Demand Draft for Rs. 45,000.
Ex.M15	—	Extract of Cheque book issue register folio page 101 (ME. 43).			Xerox copy of Central Bank of India Demand Draft for Rs. 5,000.
Ex.M16	24-07-2002	Letter by petitioner (ME. 44).	Ex.M39	02-08-2002	Copy of TT /ES Payable—Section Day Book.
Ex.M17	20-05-2002	Letter by petitioner (ME. 45).	Ex.M40	25-07-2002	Copy of Sundry Deposit Section Day Book.
Ex.M18	16-07-2002	Sanction accorded in respect of claim preferred by LR's of Mr. Abdul Wahab (ME.47).	Ex.M41	—	FBP Register Folio—33.
Ex.M19	—	Claim papers filed by LR's of Mr. Abdul Wahab (ME. 48).	Ex.M42	—	Work allocation from November 2001.
Ex.M20	—	Attendance Register for March 2002 (ME. 52).	Ex.M43	—	Attendance Register copy for March, 2002.
Ex.M21	—	Attendance Register for April 2002 (ME. 53).	Ex.M44	02-08-2002	Credit Voucher for Rs. 60,000.
Ex.M22	—	Attendance Register for May 2002 (ME. 54).	Ex.M45	02-08-2002	Credit Voucher for Rs. 10,000.
Ex.M23	—	Attendance Register for July 2002 (ME. 55).	Ex.M46	02-08-2002	Cheque No. 310025 for Rs. 31025.
Ex.M24	—	Investigation report submitted by K. Visvanathan (ME. 56).	Ex.M47	02-08-2002	Credit Voucher for Rs. 50,000.
			Ex.M48	01-08-2002	Telegram received on 01-08-2002.
			Ex.M49	—	Locker No. 48 Sheet in the name of Abdul Wahab.
			Ex.M50	25-07-2002	Letter from Chief Manager, Indian Bank to Deputy Manager, Indian Bank (C.O) - North, Chennai.

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 183.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन रेयर अर्थ्स लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, इर्नाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 32/2009) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/6/2009-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 183.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 32/2009) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ernakulam now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Rare Earths Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. L-29011/6/2009-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT ERNAKULAM**

PRESENT: Shri P. L. Norbert, B. A. LLB., Presiding Officer
(Tuesday the 1st day of December, 2009/10th
Agrahayana, 1931)

I. D. 32/2009

- Union :**
1. The General Secretary,
Kerala Minerals Employees Congress,
Chavara P. O. Distt. Quilon,
Chavara (Kerala)
 2. The Secretary,
IRE Bagging Contract Workers
Welfare Forum, Karithura Chavara P. O.
Distt. Kollam (Kerala).
- Management :** The Head,
Indian Rare Earths Limited,
Chavara P. O. Distt. Kollam,
Kollam (Kerala)-691583.
By Adv. M/s Menon & Pai.

This case coming up for hearing on 01-02-2009, this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on the same day passed the following.

AWARD

This is a reference made under Section 10 (1) (d) of Industrial Disputes Act challenging the action of the management in denying employment to 10 employees belonging to the first union.

2. Summons was issued to both unions and management. Though both sides entered appearance initially, when the case was posted for claim statement, both unions remained absent. There was no representation also. No vakalat is seen filed. In the circumstances it has to be presumed that there no existing dispute for adjudication.

In the result an award is passed finding that the action of the management in denying employment to 10 employees is legal and justified and the employees are not entitled for any relief.

The award will come into force one month after its publication in the Official Gazette.

Ditated to the Personai Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 1st day of December, 2009.

P. L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer

Appendix-Nil

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 184.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोचीन रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, इर्नाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 25/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/38/2007-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 184.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 25/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ernakulam now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kochi Refineries Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. L-30011/38/2007-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
ERNAKULAM

PRESENT : Shri P. L. Norbert, B. A. LLB., Presiding Officer
(Wednesday the 2nd day of December, 2009/11th
Agrahayana, 1931)

I. D. 25/2007

Union : 1. The Cochin Refinery Worker's
Association. (CRWA),
Ambalamughal,
Kochi Refinery,
Kochi (Kerala)-682 302.
By Adv. K. S. Madhusoodanan.
2. The General Secretary,
Cochin Refinery Employees Union,
Ambalamughal,
By Adv. C. Anilkumar.

Management : 2. The General Manager (HRM),
Kochi Refineries Limited,
Ambalamughal, Cochin-682 302
By Adv. M/s Menon & Pai.

This case coming up for hearing on 02-12-2009, this
Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on the same day passed the
following.

AWARD

This is a reference made under Section 10 (1) (d) of
Industrial Disputes Act regarding fixation of pay on
promotion.

2. Though both sides entered appearance and filed
their pleadings when the matter came up for evidence
mangement and counsel remained absent and there
was no representation. The witness of the union was
present and filed proof affidavit in lieu of chief
examination. The unions produced nine documents.
The proof affidavit and the documents are marked as
WW1 and Exts. W1 to 9. The documentary and oral
evidence of the unions prove their claim that the pay
of workers on promotion is to be fixed in accordance
with the long term settlement, Ext. W8. The evidence
of the unions stands unchallenged.

In the result an award is passed finding that the
action of the management in fixing the basic pay of
workmen on promotion to managerial position of first
line supervisors, at a rate less than what they were
drawing before their promotion is unfair and
unjustified and the workers are entitled to get their
pay fixed in accordance with clauses 13 (c) and 14 of
Ext. W8 long term settlement.

The award will come into force one month after its
publication in the Official Gazette.

Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and
typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this
the 2nd day of December, 2009.

P. L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer
Appendix-Nil

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 185.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947
का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. पी. सी.
एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच
अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक
अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ, संख्या
181/2003 एवं 37/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार
को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/57/2001-आई आर (एम)]

[सं. एल-30012/38/2003-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 185.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central
Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.
No. 181/2003&37/2005) of the Central Government
Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-1, Chandigarh now as
shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between
the employers in relation to the management of BPCL,
and their workman, which was received by the Central
Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. L-30012/57/2001-IR (M)]

[No. L-30012/38/2003-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHURU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE .

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. No. 181/2003 & 37/2005

1. Shri Manbir Singh C/o Shri Karan Singh,
Secretary Bharti Mazd Sangh, Lal Bati Chowk,
G.T. Road, Panipat.
2. Shri Ved Parkash S/o Sh. Babu Ram, C/o BMS
Office, Lal Bati Chowk, G.T. Road, Panipat.

... Applicants

Versus

1. The Manager, Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd.,
Village Dadlana, Teh. & Dist. Panipat (Haryana)

2. The Executive Director, BPCL, Panipat Despath Unit, Panipat (Haryana)

... Respondents

APPEARANCES

For the workman	Workmen in person with representative Sh. Karan Singh
For the Management	Sh. G.D. Maheshwari & Sh. Vivek Kaushal, Advocates.

AWARD

Passed on 2-12-09

This Award shall dispose of two references of different workman referred by Central Government by different notifications. The references which are being disposed of by this Award are as follows :—

1. No. L-30012/57/2001/IR(M) Dated 30-10-2003 (Sh. Manbir Singh)
2. No. L-30012/38/2003/IR(M) Dated 29-08-2005 (Sh. Ved Parkash)

Common questions of law and facts are involved in both the references, hence, the reference are disposed of by a single Award. In both references, the nature of work claimed to be worked by each workman is also similar.

In both the references, the workmen have claimed that they worked with the management for more than 240 days as Operator Shilling (RTW)/Security Guard respectively in the preceding year from the date of termination. They were directly appointed by the management of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Panipat. Their services were retrenched by the management without payment of retrenchment compensation. No notice before their retrenchment was given. On the basis of these facts, both the workmen have prayed for declaration of their retrenchment, as illegal being against the provisions of the Act and for their reinstatement into the services with full back wages.

The management of respondent appeared and contested the claim of each workman by filing written statement. It is contended by the management that none of the workman was directly appointed by the management. The services of the workmen were provided through the contractor. The management also challenged the employer and employee relationship with the workman.

On perusal of pleadings of the parties, it is evidently clear that the main issue for adjudication before this Tribunal is: whether workmen are employees of the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Panipat? The consequential question to be answered is whether their termination from the services is illegal and the relief to be given to the workmen, if any?

Opportunity for adducing evidence was given to the parties. Statement of every workman was recorded by this

Tribunal. On behalf of the management, one Officer of Corporation in each file filed the affidavit and he was cross-examined by learned counsel of the workman.

Parties were heard at length. Learned counsel for the workman argued that both the workmen were engaged/appointed by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation. If their appointments and rendering the services have been shown through contractor, it is illegal being against the provisions of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. It is also submitted by learned counsel of the workmen that both the workmen were directly under the administrative control for the management. They were paid wages by the management of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation and in fact, they were the employees of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation and that of not any contractor.

On the other hand learned counsel for the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation submitted that all the workmen worked through a contractor, hence, there is no master-servant relationship between them. Different contractors provided with the services to the management. The contractor was paid the wages and accordingly, contractor paid the wages to the workmen. None of the workman was under the administrative control of the management.

The issue of employer-employee relationship between the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation and the workmen is a mixed question of facts and law, and accordingly, shall be adjudicated on the basis of evidence and pleadings of the parties.

In both the references, it is admitted fact that no appointment letter was issued by the management. It is denied by the workmen that the payment of wages were made good by the contractors, but on perusal of the documents filed by the management, it is evidently clear that the payment to the workmen were made good by the respective contractors and not by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation. Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2008 LLR-801, GM ONGC Silchur Vs ONGC Contractual Workers Union had laid down the criteria to establish the direct employee-employer relationship between the workmen and the management of any organization. If the ratio of GM ONGC Silchur's case (supra) is applied in the instant references, the workmen have to prove the following facts to establish the employee-employer relationship :—

1. That there existed a relationship of master and servant.
2. That there was no contractor appointed by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd.
3. The management of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., used to supervise the alleged work assigned to individual workers.

4. That the management of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. took disciplinary action and called for explanation from the workers.
5. That the workers were paid wages by the management of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., directly and not through the contractor.
6. At the cost of repetition, the wages were paid directly to the workers by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., and the acquaintance roll were prepared by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., to make the payment to the workers.

If the above mentioned ratio of GM ONGC, Silchur's case (supra) is applied in both of the references, it is clear that workmen have failed to prove that they were appointed/engaged by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation. There is no iota of evidence on record to prove that they were directly under the administrative control of the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation. No doubt, it is contended by the workmen that their attendance were marked by the officers/officials of management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation, but it will not be sufficient to prove the administrative control over them.

The documents also prove that the Agency who provided with the services to the Corporation paid the wages to the workmen. In none of the case the management has paid the wages directly to the workman. It is admitted that no appointment letter was given to any of the workman. None of the workman applied for the post on which they claimed to work. They were supposed to file/adduce some cogent evidence like sanction of leave application, disciplinary action, if any, taken by the management etc. to prove the administrative control of the management over them. Few instances by filing copy of certain challans have been shown by the workmen and in my view this is not the sufficient evidence to prove the administrative control over workmen.

On the payment of wages, the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation has filed the documentary evidence, which proves that consolidated amount on the basis of number of days worked by the workmen were paid to the contractor and the contractor on the other hand used to pay wages to the workmen. The management has filed all the relevant documents, such as, attendance sheet signed by the officers of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation, order of payment passed on attendance of the workmen to the contractor, and thereafter, the payment of wages by the contractor to the workmen. Moreover, the management has also filed the detailed description of pay rolls containing all the details of payment of wages made good to its workmen, employees and officers. The name of workmen did not find place in these pay rolls.

The management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation has also apprised this Tribunal that there is the procedure for recruitment of workmen for a particular work. No workman was recruited/appointed as per the rules of the department. Their services were provided with by a contractor on outsourcing.

On perusal of all the evidence, oral and documentary, given by the workmen/officer of the management of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation, I am of the view that payment of wages to all the workmen were made good by the contractor and not by the management of Indian Oil Corporation.

The above discussion proves that neither the workmen were appointed/engaged by the management of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation nor they were under the administrative control of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation. They were also not paid the wages by Bharat Petroleum Corporation. Hence, there existed no master-servant relationship between the management of Indian Oil Corporation and the workmen.

Almost in both the references, it is also contended by the workman that the contract, if any, shown by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation was camouflage and shame. In ONGC Silchur's case (supra) the conditions under which a contract can be treated camouflage and shame are mentioned. Hon'ble Supreme Court in this case has relied upon the law laid down in Steel Authority of India Ltd. and others Vs. National Union Water workers and Others AIR 2001 SC-3527. The question before this Tribunal is under what circumstances the contract between management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation and the workmen can be held to be shame and camouflage? In case the contract has been held to be shame and camouflage, the contract labour working under the management of principal employer are held to be the employees of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation. It depends on the facts and circumstances of each case, whether the contract executed in between management and the contractor is camouflage and shame? It is also an issue of facts and has to be decided on the facts and circumstances of the case. Whether there is a genuine contractor, and whether there is a proper master-servant relationship in between. the management of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation and the workmen also depends on the facts and circumstances of each reference? The Court/Tribunal has to apprise whether these facts emerged in reality or there was some paper arrangement to make the payment good to the workmen through contractor?

Almost in all the references, the nature of contract is challenged by the workmen. No doubt, in almost all the references it is not mentioned in the pleadings that there was a contract between the contractor and the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation. But the documents provided with and filed by the management of Indian Oil

Corporation proved that the workmen were having the notice and knowledge that their services are being taken through a contractor. On the basis of the documents, I am of the view that prior to raising the Industrial dispute; the workmen were having the knowledge and notice that their services were provided to the management of Indian Oil Corporation through contractor, but there is no mention of this fact in pleadings except in two references. It is contended by the workmen that the contract is shame and camouflage and void being against the provisions of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. Unless and until the terms and conditions as laid down in GM ONGC's case (supra) are not fulfilled, no workman can be treated as the direct employee of Indian Oil Corporation.

The next issue for the disposal before this Tribunal is whether the workmen will be deemed to be in the services of the management of Indian Oil Corporation on account of violation of any of the provisions of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition), Act 1970 ? It is issue of law and has limited concern with the facts. On the issue of facts, I have already given my view that the workmen are not employees of the management of Indian Oil Corporation, but their services were provided with to the management by the different contractors. As this issue of law is also raised by the parties, it is the duty of this Tribunal to decide it as well. On this issue, I am of the view that there may be three circumstances :—

1. There may be a case where the practice of contract labour is prohibited by the appropriate Government under Section 10(1) of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970.
2. There may be an issue regarding the registration of establishment of principal employer under Section 7 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970.
3. There may be an issue regarding the license by the contractor under Section 12 of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970.

The issue to be decided is whether in the case of violation of any of the provisions mentioned under Section 10(1), Section 7 and Section 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970, the contract labour shall be deemed to be an employee of the principal employer ?

This issue has been settled by Hon'ble the Apex Court in *Steel Authority of India Ltd.'s case (supra)*. Moreover, Punjab and Haryana High Court in *Food Corporation of India and others Vs. Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Chandigarh and others 2008 LLR 391*, has decided this issue after relying the ratio of *Steel Authority of India Ltd., case (supra)*. Without mentioning the relevant paras of *Steel Authority of India Ltd., case (supra)* and of *Food Corporation of India and others Vs. Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I's case (supra)*, I am relying the ratio of both of the

judgments, and the ratio of both of the judgment is that if there is any violation of Section 7 and Section 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, then only penal provisions of Section 23 and Section 25 of the said Act are attracted. Hence, it is nowhere provided that such employees, employed through the contractor would become employees of the principal employer.

Accordingly, I am of the view that none of the workmen was the employee of the management. There was no relationship of master-servant and the employer and employee between the workmen and the management of Indian Oil Corporation. Thus, no question for termination of the services of the workmen by Indian Oil Corporation arises. Both of the references are answered accordingly, and the workmen are not entitled for any relief. Let Central Government be approached for publication of the award, and thereafter, the file be consigned to record room.

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 186.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. कानहुपुर स्टोन माईन्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 225/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/22/2000-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 186.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 225/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Kanhupur Stone Mines. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. 1.-29012/22/2000-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under section 10 (1) (d) & (2A) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 225 of 2000

Parties: Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Kanhupur Stone Mines and Their workmen

Present : Sri H. M. Singh, Presiding Officer

For the Employers : None.

For the Workman : None.

State: Jharkhand

Industry: Coal

Dated 10th November, 2009

AWARD

By Order No. L- 29012/22/2000/IR (M) dated. 23-6-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section(1) and sub-section (2A) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“ Whether the action of the management of M/s. Kanhupur Stone Mines in terminating the services of their workman Sh. Badradoja Sheikh w.e.f. 9-11-97 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?”

2. This reference case was received in this Tribunal on 11-8-2000. Thereafter, notices were sent to the parties to file written statement by sponsoring union/workman. In spite of notices sent by speed post no written statement has been filed by the workman till 20-7-09. It, therefore, appears that neither the concerned workman nor the sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

In such, circumstances, I render No Dispute Award in this reference case.

H. M. Singh Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 187.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल एयरपोर्ट ऑथोरिटी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, नई दिल्ली पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 57/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/8/2007-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 187.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 57/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/ Labour Court No. 1, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of National Airport Authority and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. L-11012/8/2007-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R.K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 1, NEW
DELHI KARKARDOOMA COURT COMPLEX, DELHI**

I. D. No. 57/2007

Vijender Kumar S/o Shri Ashloof,
C/o Delhi Labour Union,
Aggarwal Bhawan, G. T. Road,
Tis Hazari,
New Delhi-110054.

....Workman

Versus

The Chairman,
National Airport Authority
Rajiv Gandhi Bhawan,
Safdarjung Airport,
New Delhi.

....Management

AWARD

Vijender Kumar joined services with the management as peon on 26-7-90. Later on he was assigned duties of driver w.e.f. 25th of July, 1991. He served the management till 31st of March, 2004. His last drawn wages were Rs. 4000 per month. On 20th of April, 2004 his services were dispensed with. He was not served with notice or given pay in lieu thereof. No retrenchment compensation was paid to him. He raised an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer. Since conciliation proceedings failed, the appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal vide order No. L-11012/8/2007 -IR(M) New Delhi, dated 9th of July, 2007 with following terms :—

“Whether the demand of Delhi Labour Union in respect of Vijender Kumar S/o Shri Ashloof Ex Driver, for reinstatement of regularization in Project Division of National Airport Authority of India, New Delhi is just, fair and legal? If yes, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date ?”

2. Claim statement was filed by the workman pleading therein that he was engaged by the management w.e.f. 26-7-90 as a peon. Subsequently duties of driver were assigned to him w.e.f. 25-7-91. He served the management to their entire satisfaction till 31-3-2004. He had unblemished and uninterrupted record of service to his credit. His last drawn wages were Rs. 4500. His services were dispensed with on 21-4-04 in violation of the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the Act). No notice pay and retrenchment compensation was paid to him at the time of termination of his services. No domestic

enquiry was conducted against him and his termination amounts to retrenchment. Action of the management amounts to unfair labour practice. He is unemployed since the date of termination of his service. He raised notice of demand dated 3-9-04 which was replied by the management vide letter dated 14-12-04, wherein it was claimed that he was never employed by the management. He has documents in his possession to prove his employment with the management. He claimed reinstatement in service with continuity and full back wages.

3. Notice of the claim statement was sent to the management on 28-7-09. Ms. Deepa Rai authorized representative appeared on behalf of the management and sought time to file written statement. Case was adjourned time and again, subject to payment of cost, to afford an opportunity to the management to file its written statement. Neither cost was paid nor written statement was filed. Hence defence of the management was struck off vide order dated 21-10-09.

4. Workman entered the witness box to testify facts. An opportunity was given to Ms. Deepa Rai, authorized representative, to purify testimony of workman by an ordeal of cross examination. She has not availed that opportunity. Workman had closed his evidence.

5. Arguments were advanced at the bar. Shri Md. Faruk, authorized representative, advanced arguments on behalf of the workman. Ms. Deepa Rai, authorized representative, presented her points of view on behalf of the management. I have given my careful consideration to the arguments advanced at the bar and cautiously perused the record. My findings on issues involved in the controversy are as follows :—

6. Vijender Kumar deposed that he joined services with the management on 22-7-90 as a peon. After one year of his service, he was assigned duties of driver with the management. Initially he was paid wages @ Rs. 1250 p.m. When duties of driver were assigned to him his wages were increased to Rs. 2500/-p.m. He served continuously with the management upto 20th of April, 2004 At the time of termination of his service his wages were Rs. 4000/- per month. Since his son was to be married on 27-4-04, he applied leave for ten days. His leave application was not accepted. He was orally told that his ten days leave has been sanctioned. After availing leave for 10 days he went to attend his duties on 1st of March 2004, but he was not allowed to join his duties. He was told that he should go on leave for one month more. He went to join his duties on 1-6-2004. At that juncture he was told that he would not be taken back on duties. He went to the office of the Conciliation Officer at Curzon Road, New Delhi. Conciliation Officer wrote a letter to the management but the management opted not to attend conciliation proceedings.

When conciliation proceedings failed the dispute was referred by the appropriate Government for adjudication: At the time of termination of his services no notice or pay in lieu thereof was given to him. Retrenchment compensation was also not paid to him. He served the management continuously from July, 1990, till April, 2004 without any break.

7. Vijender Kumar unfolds that legal notice of demand, served on the management, is Ex.WWI/1. It was sent by registered post. Vide letter dated 26-7-90 he was employed by the management, copy of which is Ex.WWI/2. On perusal of Ex.WWI/2 it came to light that Vijender Kumar was appointed as a peon for a period of one year. Therefore, it is clear that in July, 1990, Vijender Kumar was appointed by the management to serve as a peon for a period of one year.

8. Certificate Ex.WWI/3 was issued by Shri S. K. Chandalia Assistant Engineer, Delhi Project Division of the management, wherein it has been specified that Vijender Kumar was working as a driver with the management and was drawing his salary @ Rs.1800/- PM. Letter Ex.MWI/4 makes it clear that Vijender Kumar worked as a M.T.driver with the management w.e.f. 2-8-91 till 28-6-93. He again started working as a driver from 1-1-94 to 23-8-95. He was again taken on job as Driver on 1-11-95 and he continuously served the management till 25-7-97, the date when the said certificate was issued.

9. Certificate Ex.WWI/5 projects that Vijender Kumar worked as a driver in Engineering Wing of the management from 7-3-97 to 30th of September, 98. He again worked with the management from October, 98 till November, 99, which fact emerge out of certificate Ex.WWI/6. He was again engaged on 7th of December, 99 and he worked with the management till 16th of June, 2000 which fact has been confirmed by Pardeep Kumar, Executive Engineer, through certificate EX.WWI/7. The workman projects that he filed his claim statement before the Conciliation Officer wherein it was mentioned that he continuously served the management w.e.f. 25-7-91 till 31-3-04 as a driver. The management filed its reply before the conciliation officer which is Ex.WWI/10, wherein it was claimed that he was never engaged by the management. Shri Faruk argued that in Ex.WWI/10 management had not disputed claim of the workman that he was initially engaged as a peon and subsequently assigned duties of a driver. He argued that the documents referred above belies the stand taken by the management in its written statement Ex.WWI/10, filed before the Conciliation Officer. When facts projected by Vijender Kumar and those detailed by the management in Ex.WWI/10 are closely perused, it came to light that the management has taken a wrong stand in its written statement filed before the Conciliation Officer.

Documents Ex.WW1/2, Ex.WW1/3, Ex.WW1/4, Ex.WW1/5, EX.WW1/6 and Ex.WW1/7 made it clear that the workman was engaged by the management initially as a peon and subsequently as a driver. The workman deposed that he served the management as a driver till 20-4-2004, when his services were dispensed with. Facts projected by him were not assailed by the management at all. Therefore, it is evident that unassailed facts testified by the workman are to be accepted as true. It has come over the record that services of the workman were dispensed with by the management in April, 2004.

10. Services of the workman were dispensed with on 20th of April, 2004. The management has not been able to establish that the services of the workman were done away by way of punishment, after a disciplinary inquiry. It has not been shown that the workman sought voluntary retirement or he was superannuated on reaching the age of superannuation. It has also not been shown that his services were dispensed with on account of non renewal of the contract of employment or on the ground of continued ill health. Therefore, it is evident that termination of the services of the workman amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Act. Services of the workman were dispensed with on 20-4-04. He presents that he served the management continuously since 2-8-91 till 20-4-04. For the purpose of continuous service for period of one year, the Tribunal had to consider as to whether the workman has been able to show a continuity of service as provided in Section 25-B of the Act.

11. "Continuous Service" has been defined by Section 25B of the Act. Under sub-section (1) of the said Section "continuous service for a period" may comprise of two period viz.(i) uninterrupted service, and (ii) interrupted service on account of (a) sickness, (b) authorized leave, (c) an accident, (d) a strike which is not legal, (e) a lock-out, and (f) a cessation of work that is not due to any fault on the part of the workman, shall be included in the "continuous service." Sub-section (2) of the said Section introduces a fiction to the effect that even if a workman is not in "continuous service" within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to in continuous service for that period under an employer if he has actually worked for the days specified in clauses (a) and (b) thereof. In Vijay Kumar Majoo (1968 Lab.I.C.1180) it was held that one year's period contemplated by sub-section (2) furnished a unit of measure and if during that unit of measure the period of service actually rendered by the workman is 240 days, then he can be considered to have rendered one year's continuous service for the purpose of the Section. The idea is that if within a unit period of one year a person had put in at least 240 days of service, then he must get the benefit conferred by the Act. Consequently, an enquiry has to be made to

find out whether the workman has actually worked for not less than 240 days during a period of 12 calendar months immediately preceding the retrenchment. Therefore, to reckon continuous service of 240 days the period of service rendered by the workman in preceding 12 calendar months shall be taken into account, from the date of termination of his services. As testified by the workman he rendered continuous service since 2-8-91 till the date of termination of his service viz., 20-4-04. To count his continuity of service from 20-4-04 period of 12 preceding calendar month has been taken into account and it came to forefront that the workman had rendered more than 240 days continuous service in preceding 12 calendar month, from the date of termination of his service.

12. When workman had rendered more than 240 days continuous service in preceding 12 months from the date of termination of his service, provision of Section 25-F of the Act is applicable to his case. The workman deposed that neither notice nor pay in lieu thereof and retrenchment compensation was paid to him.. Consequently it is evident that his retrenchment is in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act.

13. Services of the workman were retrenched without payment of notice pay and retrenchment compensation. It is well settled that in a case of wrongful retrenchment, dismissal or discharge, the normal rule is to award reinstatement. But where a case falls in any of the exception to general rule, the industrial adjudicator has discretion to award reasonable and adequate compensation, in lieu of re-instatement. Section 11A of the Act vests the industrial adjudicator with discretionary jurisdiction to give "such other relief to the workman" in lieu of discharge or dismissal as the circumstances of the case may require, where for some valid reasons it considers that reinstatement with or without conditions will not be fair or proper.

14. Workman projects that he is unemployed these days. As and when he got labour job he performed it. Facts projected by the workman were not controverted by the management. Consequently it emerges over the record that the workman remained unemployed since the date of termination of his service. However he did labour job as and when he could get. Taking into account all these facts I am of the considered opinion that for the period of unemployment workman is entitled at least 30% of his wages. In view of the foregoing reasons it is ordered that the management shall reinstate the services of the workman with continuity and 30% of his wages. An Award is accordingly passed.

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

Delhi,
27th November, 2009

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 188.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एल.आई. सी. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अजमेर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 4/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-17011/3/2006-आई आर (एम)]
कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 188.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.4/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ajmer now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of LIC and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No.L-17011/3/2006-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण, अजमेर

सीआईटीआर नं. 4/07

[रेफरेंस संख्या एल-17011/3/2006-आईआर (एम)
दिनांक 11-5-07]

दी प्रेसीडेंट, ऑफ इण्डिया शिडयूल
कास्ट/शिडयूल ट्राइब एण्ड बुद्धिष्ट,
एल आई सी एम्प्लोयिज वेलफेयर
एसोसिएशन, द्वारा एल आई सी
रीजनल आफिस, रानाडे मार्ग,
अजमेर

—प्रार्थी यूनियन

बनाम

एल आई सी ऑफ इण्डिया,
दी सीनियर डीवीजनल मैनेजर,
एल आई सी ऑफ इण्डिया,
डीवीजनल आफिस,
जीवन प्रकाश, रानाडे मार्ग,
पीबी. 2, अजमेर

—अप्रार्थी-नियोजक

समक्ष : श्री मिथिलेश कुमार शर्मा, आर एच जे एस

प्रार्थी की ओर से : श्री डी. डी., एडवोकेट

अप्रार्थी की ओर से : श्री कृष्ण अवतार, एडवोकेट

अवार्ड

दिनांक 12-11-09

श्रम मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली से प्राप्त रेफरेंस इस प्रकार है कि :-

“Whether the action of Sr. Divisional Manager, LIC Divisional Office, Ranaday Marg, Ajmer in deducting two increments permanently from the Salary of Sh. Omparkash Singh S/o Sh. Puran Singh in a bid to recover of loss of Rs. 1928 occurred to the corporation is just and legal? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

नोटिस के उपरांत प्रार्थी पक्ष उपस्थित आये। प्रार्थी की ओर से अपना मांग पत्र प्रेषित कर उसमें कथन किये गये हैं कि श्रमिक ओमप्रकाश को अप्रार्थी ने एक आरोप पत्र दिनांक 8-3-02 को देते हुए उस पर यह आरोप लगाया कि उसने दिनांक 3-3-02 को मण्डल कार्यालय, अजमेर में निगम की सम्पत्ति को नुकसान पहुंचाते हुए तीन कांच जो मुख्य द्वार उसके सामने के द्वार एवं कंटीन के कांच तोड़ दिये और स्वागत कक्ष पर लगे कम्प्यूटर के तार भी तोड़ दिये और कम्प्यूटर को नुकसान पहुंचाने का प्रयास किया गया। उक्त आरोप पत्र के सम्बन्ध में अनुशासनात्मक कार्यवाही को अमल में लेते हुए उसके विरुद्ध विभागीय कार्यवाही आरंभ की गई और श्रमिक के विरुद्ध पूर्वाग्रसित और बायज्ड होते हुए प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों के विपरीत दिनांक 11-7-03 को दण्डादेश पारित किया गया। जिसमें उसकी दौ वेतनवृद्धियां स्थाई रूप से घटाये जाने तथा 1928 रुपये की वसूली निगम को हुए नुकसान बाबत वसूली किये जाने की शासित प्रदान की गई।

श्रमिक की ओर से आगे कथन किये गये हैं कि उक्त दण्डादेश के विरुद्ध अपीलीय अधिकारी के समक्ष अपील भी पेश की थी जिस पर श्रमिक को बिना व्यक्तिगत रूप से सुने तथा बिना अभिलेख का अवलोकन किये 31-3-04 को अपील को निरस्त कर दी। जिसके विरुद्ध श्रमिक ने एक मेमोरियल याचिका भी दिनांक 1-11-04 को श्रीमान अध्यक्ष, जीवन बीमा निगम के समक्ष पेश की गई जिस पर भी प्रार्थी को ना तो सुनवाई के लिये व्यक्तिगत रूप से अवसर दिया और ना ही अभिलेख का अवलोकन किया और प्रार्थी श्रमिक को दिया गया दण्डादेश दिनांक 11-7-03 को बहाल रखा। आगे उसने अपने मांग पत्र/क्लेम में यह वर्णित किया है कि दिनांक 3-3-02 को रविवार को क्रिकेट मैच के पश्चात् लंच के दौरान श्रमिक और एक अन्य सहकर्मी श्री सतीश बाकोलिया के मध्य हाथापाई व गाली गलौच होना कहा है जिसमें उक्त घटना के दौरान मण्डल कार्यालय, अजमेर की सम्पत्ति में कांच के द्वार तोड़े जाना और कम्प्यूटर के तार

तोड़े जाने का एवं निगम को हानि पहुंचाने का प्रयास करने बाबत शिकायत उक्त जांच कार्यवाही के दौरान दिनांक 16-7-02 को प्रार्थी की ओर से उक्त जांच कार्यवाही में प्रस्तुति अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत हुई। प्रार्थी पक्ष का यह भी कथन है कि उनके द्वारा प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध की गई शिकायत पत्र दिनांक 3-3-02 की प्रति एवं अप्रार्थी को दिये गये प्रत्रांक 26-3-02, 12-4-02 एवं 26-4-02 की मांग की किन्तु श्रमिक पक्ष को उक्त दस्तावेजात उपलब्ध नहीं करवाये गये। उसका यह भी कथन है कि इस मामले में जिस चौकीदार मंगल सिंह के हाथ की रिपोर्ट होना बताया गया है तहरीर पर प्राप्ति की दिनांक, सील और प्राप्ति अधिकारी के हस्ताक्षर और उनका कोई रिमार्क जो कार्यालय के साधारण अनुक्रम में प्रत्येक पत्र पर अंकित होता है नहीं होने के कारण उक्त कथित तहरीरी शिकायत को संशयपूर्ण बताया है। उसका यह भी कथन है कि उसने 4-3-02 को इस प्रकरण में दोषी व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध शिकायत पेश की थी किन्तु उसके विरुद्ध कोई कार्यवाही न करते हुए प्रार्थी पर गलत रूप से कार्यवाही की है। उसका कथन यह भी है कि इस मामले में अप्रार्थी पक्ष ने एक भी चशमदीद गवाह को पेश नहीं किया है और ना ही ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति का नाम जांच अधिकारी ने अपनी जांच में या आरोप पत्र में ही उल्लेखित किया है। श्रमिक पक्ष का यह भी कथन है कि इस घटना की शिकायत मंगल सिंह नामक चौकीदार ने की है जिसमें यह बताया गया है कि उस समय अनुराग मिश्रा, ओ. पी. पाण्डे, जितेन्द्र कुमार एवं नागर की उपस्थिति में यह घटना हुई थी किन्तु उक्त गवाहान को परीक्षित करने का अवसर प्रार्थी को नहीं दिया गया है। प्रार्थी पक्ष का यह भी कथन है कि श्री प्रदीप कृपलानी की साक्ष्य जांच में ली गई है जिसका नाम ना तो शिकायत पत्र में है और ना ही उक्त व्यक्ति का नाम चौकीदार ने अपनी शिकायत में चशमदीद गवाह के रूप में वक्त दुर्घटना होना दर्शित किया है। ऐसे में इस गवाह के बयान विश्वसनीय नहीं माने जाने के कथन अपनी मांग पत्र में वर्णित किये हैं। अंत में प्रार्थी पक्ष ने अप्रार्थी द्वारा दिया गया दण्डादेश निरस्त करते हुए उसकी रोकी गई दो वार्षिक वेतन वृद्धियों को बहाल करने व 1928 रु. की शास्ति का दण्डादेश निरस्त करने की प्रार्थना की है।

अप्रार्थी ने प्रार्थी का क्लेम का जवाब पेश करते हुए अपने जवाब मांग पत्र में यह वर्णित किया है कि प्रार्थी ओमप्रकाश अप्रार्थी संस्थान में सहायक के पद पर कार्यरत है किन्तु वह श्रमिक की श्रेणी में नहीं आता है। उनका यह भी कथन है कि प्रार्थी द्वारा जो मण्डल परिसर में तोड़-फोड़ की गई उसके सम्बन्ध में नियमानुसार अनुशासनिक कार्यवाही अमल में लाई गई। उनका यह भी कथन है कि प्रार्थी को अपनी जांच में बचाव का पर्याप्त अवसर दिया गया और उसके बाद ही आरोप सं. 2 सिद्ध पाये जाने पर दण्डित किया गया और दो वार्षिक वेतन वृद्धियां रोके जाने एवं 1928 रुपये की शास्ति आरोपित की गई। अप्रार्थी पक्ष का यह भी कथन है कि प्रार्थी ने जो अपील की थी उसे नियमानुसार खारिज की गई। उनका यह भी कथन है कि प्रार्थी को बचाव का पर्याप्त अवसर दिया गया प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों

के अनुरूप ही दण्डादेश पारित किया गया। प्रार्थी की मांग करने पर दस्तावेजात की प्रतियां उपलब्ध करा दी थी। उसके विरुद्ध किसी प्रकार की प्रीज्यूडिस एवं बायस होकर दण्डादेश पारित नहीं किया गया। उसका यह भी कथन है कि प्रार्थी ने कभी 26-3-02, 12-4-02 एवं 26-4-02 के पत्रों की प्रतियां की मांग नहीं की और उसे लिखित शिकायत की प्रति तो पूर्व में ही दे दी गई थी। उनका यह भी कथन है कि जांच अधिकारी द्वारा साक्ष्य का विवेचन कर आरोप प्रार्थी पर पूर्णतया सिद्ध पाया गया है। उनका यह भी कथन है कि प्रार्थी पर लगाई गई शास्ति की वसूली उसके वेतन से सही कटौती की गई है। अंत में अप्रार्थी की ओर से कथन किया गया है कि अप्रार्थी ने प्रार्थी को जो दण्डादेश पारित किया है वह नियमानुसार प्रार्थी पर आरोप सिद्ध पाये जाने पर ही दण्डादेश पारित किया है इस वजह से प्रार्थी का क्लेम सव्यय खारिज किये जाने की प्रार्थना की है।

प्रार्थी की ओर से अपने दस्तावेजात के समर्थन में वरिष्ठ मण्डल प्रबंधक को प्रेषित शिकायत की प्रति, आरोप पत्र की प्रतिलिपि, विभागीय कार्यवाही के संबंध में मांगे जाने वाली कमेंट्स की प्रति, जांच रिपोर्ट की प्रति, एवं दण्डादेश की प्रति प्रस्तुत की है जबकि अप्रार्थी की ओर से प्रस्तुत किये गये दस्तावेजात में जांच पत्रावली व उससे सम्बन्धित कार्यवाहियों के दस्तावेज की प्रति दण्डादेश व अपीलीय आदेश की प्रतियां पेश की हैं।

उपरोक्त तथ्यों के अभिवचनों एवं दस्तावेजात पर दोनों पक्षों को सुना गया तथा उभय पक्षी द्वारा प्रस्तुत लिखित बहस का अवलोकन किया।

विद्वान अभि. प्रार्थी की दलील है कि प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध झूठे आरोप लगाये गये हैं। जिस दिन की घटना बतलाई है उस दिन रविवार का अवकाश था। इस कारण कोई कार्यालय संबंधी कार्य प्रार्थी करने के लिये बाध्य नहीं था, सतीश बाकोलिया ने प्रार्थी के साथ मारपीट की और उसके चोटें भी आई किन्तु प्रार्थी को शिकायत पर कार्यवाही नहीं की और गलत रूप से जांच कर एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही की जिसे अपास्त करने की दलील दी है।

विद्वान अभि. प्रार्थी की यह भी दलील है कि प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध जारी आरोप पत्र के जवाब का पूर्ण अवसर नहीं दिया गया। उसे सम्बन्धित दस्तावेजात की प्रतियां नहीं दी गई जो घटना के गवाहान बताये गये हैं उनको परीक्षित नहीं करवाया गया है और जांच प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों के अनुरूप नहीं कर दुर्भावना से प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध जांच की गई जिसे अपास्त करने की दलील दी है।

विद्वान अभि. प्रार्थी की यह दलील है कि जिस मैत्री मेच का आयोजन करने का तथ्य कहा है उसके दोपहर के भोजन में मांस व मंदिरा का प्रयोग किया गया जो कि आयोजकों के द्वारा गलत कार्य किया गया था और प्रार्थी ने जब उसका विरोध किया तो उसके विरुद्ध कार्यवाही गलत रूप से की गई इस आधार पर की गई विभागीय जांच को दोषपूर्ण घोषित किये जाने की प्रार्थना की है।

विद्वान अभि. अप्रार्थी की दलील है कि प्रार्थी के द्वारा जो अनुशासनहीनता की गई थी उसके लिये उसे आरोपपत्र जारी किया गया था। प्रार्थी को आरोप पत्र की प्रति दी गई, शिकायत की प्रति दी, प्रार्थी जांच के दौरान उपस्थित हुआ। अप्रार्थी की ओर से जांच के दौरान जो गवाह जांच अधिकारी के समक्ष पेश किये गये उनसे प्रार्थी को जिरह का अवसर दिया गया। प्रार्थी के द्वारा किन्हीं दस्तावेजों की मांग नहीं की गई और प्रार्थी ने ऐसा कोई प्रार्थनापत्र भी पेश नहीं किया जिसके द्वारा दस्तावेजात मांगे गये हो। प्रार्थी की ओर से यह भी स्पष्ट नहीं किया गया है कि किस दस्तावेजात के नहीं मिलने से उसका बचाव किस प्रकार प्रभावित हुआ और जांच कार्यवाही में प्रार्थी की सक्रिय भागीदारी होने की दलील देते हुए जांच प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों के अनुरूप होने की दलील दी है।

विद्वान अभिभाषक अप्रार्थी की यह भी दलील है कि मैत्री मैच अवकाश के दिन अवश्य था लेकिन एन आई सी आफ इण्डिया स्टाफ रेगुलेशन, 1960 के नियम 24 के अनुसार इस प्रकार के मैच आयोजन किये जाते हैं जिनमें कर्मचारियों के सक्रिय रूप से भाग लिये जाने के कारण उस दिन की वेतन देय होने के कारण वह कार्य पर उपस्थित माने जाते हैं। इस कारण प्रार्थी के द्वारा किया गया कृत्य गंभीर अनुशासनहीनता की दलील देते हुए दिया गया दण्ड उचित होने तथा की गई विभागीय जांच फेर एण्ड प्रोपर होने की दलील दी है।

जवाबी बहस में विद्वान अभि. प्रार्थी की दलील है कि प्रार्थी के साथ अन्य कर्मचारी द्वारा मारपीट किये जाने के कारण उसके चोटें आई थी लेकिन उसके द्वारा जो पुलिस में केस दर्ज कराया था वह दबाव में लेकर वापस करवा दिया गया और इस आधार पर प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध दुर्भावना से कार्यवाही करने की दलील दी है।

उपरोक्त दलीलों के संदर्भ में मैंने पत्रावली का अध्ययन किया तो पाया कि प्रार्थी के द्वारा प्रस्तुत किये गये दस्तावेजात में एक प्रार्थनापत्र प्रार्थी के द्वारा दिनांक 4-3-02 को वरिष्ठ मण्डल प्रबंधक अजमेर के समक्ष प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिसमें दिनांक 3-3-02 को 7-8 कर्मचारियों के द्वारा एकराय होकर प्रार्थी के साथ मारपीट करने तथा कार्यालय कंटैन में बंद करने का तथ्य वर्णित किया गया है। इसी दस्तावेजात की प्रति प्रदर्श एम-64 व उसके साथ संलग्न परिवाद सी-पेश किया गया है। जो एम-63 के रूप में है और एम-62 कार्यालय टिप्पणी भी अप्रार्थी ने पेश की है जिसमें यह वर्णित है कि—

“दिनांक 3-3-02 को रविवार को स्टाफ क्लब की ओर से क्रिकेट मैच के पश्चात् लंच का आयोजन किया गया था। लंच समाप्ति के पश्चात् करीब 3 बजे तक अधिकतम उम्मीदवार अपने घर खाना हो चुके थे उसके पश्चात् शाम करीब 5 बजे मंगल सिंह चौकीदार जो ड्यूटी पर उपस्थित था, ने फोन पर सूचना दी कि प्रार्थी ने झगड़ा कर लिया है। जो सतीश बाकोलियों से किया है। आफिस में लगे गेट के शीशे तोड़ दिये हैं। जब मुआयना किया तो मेन गेट के शीशे, कंटोन गेट के

शीशे, स्वागत काउंटर के पीछे वाले शीशे टूटे हुए थे एक कुर्सी गेट के पास उल्टी पड़ी हुई थी। चौकीदार ने यह भी बताया कि उक्त तोड़ फोड़ श्री सिंह ने की है और उसने शराब भी पी रखी थी। वह सतीश से झगड़ा कर रहा था। लॉग उसे आफिस से बाहर लाने की कोशिश कर रहे थे लेकिन वह किसी की मान नहीं रहा था।”

उपरोक्त तथ्यों का आरोप पत्र जिसमें शीशे आदि तोड़ने के साथ कम्प्यूटर के तार भी तोड़ने का तथ्य वर्णित किया है। प्रदर्श एम-60 प्रार्थी को जारी किया गया। उस पर प्रार्थी ने दिनांक 26-3-03 को एक प्रार्थनापत्र वरिष्ठ मण्डल अधिकारी के समक्ष दिया (एम-59) जिसमें आरोप पत्र में अंकित पत्र। प्रारम्भिक जांच कार्यवाही की प्रति, व जवाब देने के लिये समय की मांग की जिसका जवाब वरिष्ठ मण्डल प्रबंधक ने 4-4-02 (एम-58) के जरिये प्रार्थी को दिया। उक्त तथ्यों से स्पष्ट होता है कि प्रार्थी को आरोप पत्र प्राप्त हो गया था और उसके पश्चात् प्रदर्श एम-57 पत्र दिनांक 8-4-02 पत्र प्रदर्श एम-55 दिनांक 20-4-02 के द्वारा प्रार्थी को जवाब प्रस्तुत करने के लिये लिखा गया। जिस पर प्रार्थी के द्वारा कोई जवाब नहीं दिया जाकर एक पत्र प्रदर्श एम-13 प्रेषित किया। जिसमें यह वर्णित किया कि उसे आभास होता है कि उसके विरुद्ध अनुशासनात्मक कार्यवाही का दृढ़ मानस है और जांच को आरंभ में ही प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों के विपरीत होना कहा है।

यहां यह उल्लेखनीय है कि प्रार्थी उसके विरुद्ध जारी आरोप पत्र का जवाब पेश करने के लिए स्वतंत्र था और जवाब के माध्यम से अपने दस्तावेजात की भी मांग कर सकता था लेकिन ऐसा उसके द्वारा नहीं किया गया है। पत्र प्रदर्श एम-47 के द्वारा रघुवीर सिंह प्रबंधक विधि एवं आचार को जांच अधिकारी नियुक्त किया गया जिसकी सूचना भी प्रार्थी को दी गई और जांच अधिकारी ने प्रार्थी को सूचित भी किया लेकिन प्रार्थी के द्वारा कोई उत्तर प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया। प्रदर्श एम-22 जांच कार्यवाही दिनांक 25-8-02 की प्रतिपेश की है। जिसमें जांच अधिकारी, प्रस्तुत अधिकारी, आरोपित कर्मचारी व सहायक कर्मचारी उपस्थित थे। जिसमें प्रश्न नं. 3 में पूछा गया कि क्या वह आरोपों को स्वीकार करता है तो उसने आरोपों को अस्वीकार किया। आगामी प्रश्न में दस्तावेजों की सूची प्राप्त होने का तथ्य स्वीकार करने व शिकायती पत्र प्राप्त होने की बात भी उसने स्वीकार की है और आगामी पेशी 8-8-02 साक्ष्य के लिये नियत की गई। जिसकी सूचना भी प्रार्थी को दी गई। जो प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना पत्र पर बदली जाकर आगे की पेशी नियत की गई। इसी दौरान प्रार्थी की ओर से एक पत्र दिनांक 3-2-02 (डब्ल्यू-34) जो कि जवाब के रूप में भी था प्रार्थी ने पेश किया जिसमें आरोप लगाये गये कि आयोजन जिसमें मांस मदिरा, अश्लील चुटकले, हंसी मजाक का खुलकर उपयोग किया जाता है उसमें जीवन बीमा निगम के रेगुलेशन लागू नहीं होते हैं और इस आधार पर कार्यवाही समाप्त करने की प्रार्थना की है।

आगामी जांच कार्यवाही की प्रति प्रदर्श एम-30 जो प्रार्थी की उपस्थिति में की गई में जांच के दौरान मंगल सिंह के बयान लिये गये। जिसने अपने बयान में कहा है कि ओ. पी. सिंह कैंटीन से निकलकर आये और सतीश से आपस में गाली-गलौच की। ओ. पी. सिंह ने छुड़ाके कांच में लात मारी और कांच तोड़ दिया। कम्प्यूटर के तार तोड़ दिये, कुर्सी उठाकर पीछे कांच में फेंक दी और यह घटना अपने सामने होना गवाह कहता है। इस गवाह से प्रार्थी ने जिरह की और जिरह में शिकायती पत्र प्रार्थी ने स्वयं अपने हस्तालेख में होना कहा है। पृष्ठ-3 पर प्रार्थी ने मंगल सिंह से कोई अन्य प्रश्न पूछने से इंकार किया है। प्रदीप कृपलानी का बयान भी लेखबद्ध किया गया है। जो प्रार्थी की उपस्थिति में लेखबद्ध किया गया है और बचाव पक्ष ने अपनी साक्ष्य के लिये तारीख नियत करवाई।

इसके पश्चात् दिनांक 5-12-02 की कार्यवाही में आगे की पेशी नियत की गई और दिनांक 16-12-02 को जो कार्यवाही हुई उसमें अप्रार्थी ने स्वयं अपना बयान दिया। जिसमें जो तथ्य कहे हैं वह जांच को असत्य साबित करने के लिए काफी नहीं है। प्रार्थी ने ऐसी कोई साक्ष्य भी पेश नहीं की है जिससे अप्रार्थी के द्वारा प्रस्तुत गवाहान जो प्रार्थी की उपस्थिति में परीक्षित किये गये, को असत्य बताया जा सके। प्रार्थी को जांच अधिकारी द्वारा प्रेषित जांच रिपोर्ट की प्रति भी दी गई थी और उस पर प्रार्थी को सुनवाई का अवसर भी दिया गया। लेकिन अनुशासनात्मक अधिकारी ने जो पत्र दिनांक 16-6-03 प्रदर्श एम-8 प्रार्थी को दिया और उसका जो जवाब प्रार्थी के द्वारा प्रदर्श एम-5 प्रस्तुत किया है उसके संबंध में कोई साक्ष्य प्रार्थी ने पेश नहीं की है। जिन दस्तावेजात की मांग प्रार्थी द्वारा की गई उनसे जांच किस प्रकार प्रभावित होती है ऐसा कोई प्रश्न गवाहान से नहीं पूछा गया। जांच कार्यवाही के दौरान वह स्वयं उपस्थित हुआ है। बयान उसके समक्ष लिये गये हैं। अनुशासनात्मक अधिकारी ने जांच रिपोर्ट की प्रति प्रार्थी को देकर उसे सुनवाई का अवसर दिया गया है। ऐसी सूरत में जांच न्याय के प्राकृतिक सिद्धांतों के अनुरूप फेयर एण्ड प्रोपर होना पाई जाती है।

जहां तक दण्डादेश का प्रश्न है। जीवन बीमा निगम रेगुलेशन 1960 के नियम 39(1) में जो दण्डादेश वर्णित किये गये हैं उन दण्डादेशों में प्रार्थी को दिया गया दण्ड अधिक गहन नहीं माना जा सकता है। यहां यह तथ्य गंभीर रूप से विचारणीय है कि जीवन बीमा निगम के अधिकारियों के द्वारा जिस मैत्री मैच का आयोजन किया गया था उसमें प्रार्थी के द्वारा शराब का सेवन करना दर्शाया गया है। प्रार्थी ने अपने जवाब पत्रों के माध्यम से बार-बार जांच अधिकारी को यह लिखा है कि दोपहर के भोजन के समय भोजन में मांस मदिरा परोसी गई। इस तथ्य की कोई जांच वरिष्ठ अधिकारियों ने नहीं की। यह एक ऐसा विषय है जिस पर विभाग के वरिष्ठ अधिकारियों के द्वारा (सतर्कता विभाग द्वारा) जो कि मुख्यालय अजमेर में पदस्थापित अधिकारियों से वरिष्ठ है द्वारा की जानी अपेक्षित थी क्योंकि यदि मैत्री मैच के दोपहर के भोजन में मांस, मदिरा यदि उपलब्ध कराई गई थी

तो प्रार्थी के कथित कृत्य के लिए आयोजक भी उत्तरे ही दायित्वाधीन है जितना कि प्रार्थी। अतः निगम का सतर्कता विभाग इस तथ्य की जांच करे यह न्यायालय द्वारा अपेक्षा की जाती है।

चूँकि जांच फेयर एण्ड प्रोपर घोषित की गई है और दण्ड के बिन्दु पर सुने जाने के पश्चात् मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचता हूँ कि प्रार्थी को जो दण्ड दिया गया वह इसके कृत्य को देखते हुए माफी योग्य तो नहीं है लेकिन निगम अधिकारी जो कि आयोजक थे उनके द्वारा जांच के दौरान दोपहर के भोजन के जो तथ्य हैं आये हैं उन्हें दृष्टिगत रखते हुए नमी का रुख अपनाया जाना उचित है और दो वार्षिक वेतन वृद्धियां जो संचयी प्रभाव से रोकी गई हैं को असंचयी प्रभाव से रोका जाकर अन्य दण्डयथावत रखना यथोचित है और तदनुसार विवाद का उत्तर प्रेषित किया जाना उचित है।

आदेश

प्रेषित विवाद का उत्तर इस प्रकार से दिया जाता है कि वरिष्ठ मण्डल प्रबंधक जीवन बीमा निगम कार्यालय रानाडे मार्ग, अजमेर के द्वारा श्री ओमप्रकाश सिंह पुत्र श्री पूरण सिंह को दिये गये दण्ड में दो वार्षिक वेतनवृद्धि संचयी प्रभाव से रोके जाने के दण्ड में परिवर्तित किया जाकर दो वार्षिक वेतनवृद्धि असंचयी प्रभाव से रोके जाने एवं प्रार्थी ओमप्रकाश से 1928 रुपये सम्पत्ति की क्षति के रूप में वसूल किये जाने का दण्ड उचित है। अन्य कोई अनुतोष प्रार्थी प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं है।

अवार्ड की प्रति केन्द्र सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाई जावे।

अवार्ड आज दिनांक 12-11-09 को खुले न्यायालय में लिखवाया जाकर सुनाया गया।

मिथिलेश कुमार शर्मा, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 189.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार में. करल सेरामिक्स लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय ईर्नाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 256/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/51/2006-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 189.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 256/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ernakulam now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Kerala Ceramics Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. L-29011/51/2006-IR(M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM

Present : Shri P. L. Norbert, B.A., LL.B., Presiding Officer

(Wednesday the 18th day of November, 2009/27th
Kartika, 1931)

I.D. 256/2006

- Union : The General Secretary,
Kerala Ceramics Workers Union
Kundara, Kollam (Kerala) 691501.
By. Adv. Sri. N. R. Roy.
- Management : The Managing Director,
M/s. Kerala Ceramics Ltd.,
Kundara P.O., Kollam (Kerala)-691501
By Adv. M/s. Menon & Pai.

This case coming up for hearing on 13-11-2009, this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on 18-11-2009 passed the following.

AWARD

This is a reference made under Section 10 (1)(d) of Industrial Disputes Act. The reference is:

“Whether the demand for the Kerala Ceramics Workers Union, Kundara, Kerala that the 29 workers as listed in the Annexure should be regularised from the date they were working on casual basis justified? If so, what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?”

2. The facts of the case in brief are as follows :—29 casual labourers of Kerala Ceramics Ltd., Kundara are claiming regularisation in service from the date of entering into service as casual labourers. The management regularised their service w.e.f. 28-01-1977 in pursuance to a long term settlement of 1979. The workers are not satisfied with the date of regularisation. They say that they were in service from 1967 onwards on different dates and they have completed 240 days of continuous service every year and hence they are entitled to be regularised from the date of initial entry into service as casual workers. Hence the dispute.

3. According to the union which has espoused the cause of 29 workers the management has not properly counted the total number of days worked by each worker prior to 1977. Hence they were not given benefits of gratuity, increment, weightage, pension, seniority etc. for the service prior to 1977. The workers had completed continuous service of 240 days every year since the date of their joining service as casual labour. Hence they are entitled to be regularised from the date they entered into service.

4. According to the management the dispute is stale as it was raised after a period of 29 years from the date of their regularisation. The worker as well as union are bound by long term settlement dated 14-08-1979 based on which workers were regularised. The union cannot challenge the terms of settlement. None of the workers have worked more than 179 days in a calendar year prior to 28-01-1977. As and when work was available these employees were engaged for casual work on daily wage basis prior to 28-01-1977. All the workers were taken through employment exchange. The authentic record of employees containing date of joining service, date of leaving service etc. maintained as per the Mines Act, is Form-B and it is prepared and signed by employees themselves. Hence the workers are not eligible for regularisation prior to 1977 or for any other benefits.

5. In the light of the above contentions the following points arise for consideration :

1. Whether regularisation in service was made in pursuance to long term settlement of 1979 ?
2. Are the workers entitled for regularization from the date of joining service as casual labourers ?

6. The evidence consists of the oral testimony of WW1 and the documentary evidence of Exts. W1 to 5 on the side of the union and MW1 and Exts. M1 to M3 series on the side of the management.

7. **Point Nos. 1 & 2 :—** It is an admitted fact that 29 workers involved in this case and mentioned in the annexure to the reference, entered service as casual labourers through employment exchange on different dates from 1969 onwards. The dates of such entry into service as casual labourers are mentioned in Ext. W1 (Ext.M1) seniority list of 01-12-1976. What is disputed by the union is the total number of days of service as casual labour during the period prior to the date of regularisation on 28-01-1977. The total period of service prior to 1977 are mentioned in the seniority list. However the union disputes its correctness. No doubt MW1 has admitted during cross examination that union had raised such a dispute. But according to the management the workers have admitted the date of their entry into service in Form-B. Ext.M2 series are Form-B containing details of service of each worker, the date of regularisation in service and other particulars. It is prepared and signed

by each worker. The date of regularisation of all the 29 workers is 28-01-1977. Assuming that Ext. W1 seniority list which was prepared on 01-12-1976 admittedly for the purpose of regularisation of casual workers, does not reflect the correct number of days of service as casual labour, still Form-B signed by the workers leave no room for objection regarding total service. That apart there was a long term agreement (LTA), Ext. W2 on 14-08-1979. It is based on LTA that workers were regularised w.e.f. 28-01-1977 (giving retrospective effect to the settlement). In annexure-I of Ext. W2 (page-17) the dates of joining regular service in the Kaolin Division of The Kerala Ceramics Ltd., Kundara are mentioned. All the 29 workers were regularised in service on 28-01-1977 and the decision to fix the date of regularisation as 28-01-1977 is one of the terms of settlement. The union is a party to the settlement. WW1 has admitted this fact repeatedly in pages 1, 2 and 4 of his deposition. It was signed in the presence of Conciliation Officer and it is a settlement under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act and hence it is binding on all unions and all workers. The union has not challenged the settlement under Section 10 of ID Act in order to vary or set aside the settlement. Since the settlement is binding on all they cannot also do so. Having accepted the position that the date of regularisation is 28-01-1977 at the time of signing LTA in 1979 a dispute is raised now in 2006 (after 27 years) regarding date of regularisation. Ext. W1 seniority list was published by the management. If the union was aggrieved by the seniority list they should have taken up the matter before the concerned authority on time. The seniority list was drawn in 1976, presumably, after consultation with the union. The long term agreement was signed in 1979. The union were aware and the workers too were aware of the seniority list. With open eyes the union agreed to the suggestion of fixing the uniform date of regularisation of service as 28-01-1977. They cannot turn round and challenge the same. Moreover the settlement is not under challenge in the reference. If so, its terms also cannot be challenged separately, namely, regularisation.

8. It was pointed out by the learned counsel for the union that the Assistant Labour Commissioner and the Regional Labour Commissioner had by their order Exts. W3 and 4 directed the management to pay gratuity counting their service as casual labour prior to 28-01-1977. But it is to be noted that even casual labourers are entitled for gratuity under Gratuity Act if they have worked continuously for a period of 240 days in an year and rendered not less than five years' service. But for regularisation that is not a criteria. It is the prerogative of the management to consider a casual employee for regularisation, taking into account the availability of vacancies, the age and educational or technical qualification of the candidate etc. Continuous service however long of a casual employee, will not confer on him a right for

regularisation. It is so held in *Secretary, State of Karnataka v. Umadevi* (2006) 4 SCC 1.

9. It was then submitted by the learned counsel for the union that the same issue of regularisation was raised before Industrial Tribunal, Kollam in ID 118/90 and an award was passed directing the management to regularise the service of casual workers from the date of joining service as casual labour. Ext. W5 is the award in ID 118/90. It relates to 38 workers. But they were contract labourers and not casual workers. Whereas in the present case all the workers were taken as casual labourers through employment exchange. If the contract is found to be sham the workers are entitled for regularisation in view of the decision in *Steel Authority Case [Steel Authority of India Ltd. v. National Union Waterfront Workers, (2001) 7 SCC 1]*. Thus the issues in both cases are not the same. The status of workers at the time of joining service was different. Hence Ext. W5 has no application to the facts of this case.

10. As already mentioned the long term settlement is binding on the union which is a party to the settlement. Even if they are not parties to the settlement, being a settlement under Section 18(3) of ID Act it is binding on all workers. It is held in *Burmah S.W. Union v. State of Kerala, AIR 1960 Kerala 190* that an agreement signed by the union under Section 18(1) of ID Act is binding on them and the terms under the agreement cannot be questioned by raising an industrial dispute under Section 10 of ID Act. In *Barauni Refinery Pragatisheel Shramik Parishad v. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (1991) 1 SCC 4* it is held that a settlement arrived in course of conciliation proceedings and signed under Section 18(3) of ID Act is binding on all the workmen of the establishment including those belonging to minority union who had raised objection to the settlement. Therefore there is no right for the union for questioning the terms of the long term settlement which was accepted by the union after negotiation with the management.

11. It was argued by the learned counsel for the management that there is inordinate delay in raising the dispute. Ext. W2 long term settlement was signed in 1979. The date of regularisation was fixed as per the settlement. The union was the 2nd union in the settlement. They slept over the matter for long 27 years and hence the claim has become stale. No doubt the union was prompt in questioning and raising the dispute regarding the date of regularisation, assuming that the settlement is not binding on them. WW 1 stated that the union had made representations to the management sufficiently early. But it was not in writing and no records are produced to show that there was any such representation. The long delay has created hurdles for the management to meet the claim. After usual period of retention the records will be destroyed. Even if old records are still there in the record room it will be very difficult to trace out records so old as 25 to 30 years. In *Ratam Chandra Samanta & Ors. v. Union*

of India & Ors. JT 1993 (3) SC 418 and Nedungadi Bank Ltd. v. K.P. Madhavankutty (2000) 2 SCC 455 it is held that long delay deprives the person of the remedy available in law. A person who has lost his remedy by lapse of time loses his right as well. The delay in this case is long and inordinate and the dispute is stale. That apart the union has no right to raise the dispute as it is one of the terms of long term settlement and the workers have no right for regularisation w.e.f. any date prior to 28-01-1977. It is held in Divisional Manager, APSRTC v. P. Lakshmoji Rao AIR 2004 SC 1503 that employees, selected and appointed on daily wage basis does not after selection automatically become regular employees from day one even if they perform duties similar to regular employees. The direction for regularisation of bus conductors right from the date of their initial appointment as daily wage employees was set aside. For all the above reasons I hold that the workers are not entitled for regularisation from a period prior to 28-01-1977 and their demand is unjustified.

In the result an award is passed finding that the demand of the union, for regularisation of 29 workers mentioned in the annexure to the reference from a date prior to 28-01-1977, is not legal and justifiable and the workers are not entitled for any relief.

The award will come into force one month after its publication in the Official Gazette.

(Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 18th day of November, 2009).

P. L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer

Appendix.

Witness for the Union

WWI—14-07-2008—Y. Titus

Witness for the Management

MWI—14-08-2009—M. A. Subramanian

Exhibits for the Union

W1—Seniority list of casual workers of Kaolin Division as on 1-12-1-976.

W2—Agreement between The Kerala Ceramics Ltd., Kundara and their workers.

W3—Notice for payment of Gratuity dated 30-04-2007 of the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Trivandrum to the Managing Director, M/s. Kerala Ceramics Ltd., Kundara.

W4—Order of Assistant Labour Commissioner and Regional Labour Commissioner.

W5—Award in I. D. 118/90 of Industrial Tribunal, Kollam.

Exhibits for the Management

M1—True copy of the seniority list published on 01-12-1976 in respect of 139 casual workers which includes 29 workmen concerned in the above dispute.

M2—Copies of Form B pertaining to 29 workmen concerned in the dispute.

M3 Series—Settlement of accounts in respect of the 20 workmen who left the service either on superannuation or on resignation.

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 190.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन रियर अर्थ्स लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 21/2008) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/2/2008-आई आर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 190.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 21/2008) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Rare Earths Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-2009.

[No. L-29011/2/2008-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT CHENNAI

Monday, the 7th December, 2009

Present: A. N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 21/2008

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Indian Rare Earths Ltd. and their Workmen)

BETWEEN

The President, : 1st Party/Petitioner Union
Mineral Workers Union,
C/o Indian Rare Earths Ltd,
Manavalakurichi-629252.

Vs

The General Manager, 2nd Party/
Respondent
Indian Rare Earths Ltd.,
Manavalakurichi-629252

APPEARANCE

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : M/s. S. Arunachalam,
Associates

For the 2nd Party/ : M/s. S. Ramasubramaniam &
Management Associates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-29011/2/2008-IR(M) dated 07-04-2008 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The Schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the refusal of the management of Indian Rare Earths Limited, Manavalakurichi to the demand of the Mineral Workers’ Union, to appoint departmental Security Guards instead of outsourcing is legal, fair and justified? If not, to what relief the Union representing the workmen are entitled to ?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 21/2008 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their advocates and filed their Claim Statement and Counter Statements as the case may be.

3. The case of the petitioner union in the Claim Statement in a nutshell is as follows :

Recruitment and Promotion Rules of the Management provides Ex-Servicemen for appointment to the category of Security Guards who had sacrificed their lives in the defence service. Recruitment of 12 Security Guards w.e.f. 01-04-2006 is violative of the rules under the settlement dated 06-03-1989 as amended on 21-02-2002. It is prayed that an adjudication may be rendered on the reference.

3. In the Counter Statement, the contentions raised precisely are as follows :

The Management is not prohibited to engage Security Personnel on contract. The dispute under reference is not maintainable. Outsourcing is not prevented

by any law. The Management is the correct person to decide the manpower for running the plant. There is no violation of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act in engaging Security Guards through Contractor. Contract workers are excluded from the purview of Certified Standing Orders. There is no unfair labour practice committed. The claim is only to be dismissed.

4. Points for consideration are :

- (i) Whether the refusal of the management to the demand of the Petitioner Union to appoint departmental Security Guards instead of outsourcing is legal, fair and justified?
- (ii) To what relief the concerned workmen are entitled ?

Points 1 & 2

5. When the reference stood posted for enquiry on behalf of the Petitioner Union, a memo was filed seeking permission to withdraw the ID. submitting that the subject matter under dispute was discussed and it was decided not to pursue the same. The memo is recorded accordingly.

6. In the result the question as to the legality, fairness and justifiability of the refusal to the demand of the Petitioner Union to appoint departmental Security Guards instead of outsourcing does not call for actual decision and, therefore, it is left open. The mere fact that the Petitioner Union has withdrawn the dispute is not a ground to hold that the refusal of the management is legal, fair and justified. The withdrawal of the dispute does not mean that the conduct of the management is legal, fair and justified. Still in the absence of evidence adduced the same is not open to challenge yet it is not possible to decide either way. Therefore, the points of reference are left open.

7. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 7th December, 2009).

A. N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : None

For the 2nd Party/Management : None

Documents Marked on the petitioner's side

Ex.No.	Date	Description
	Nil	

On the Management's side

Ex.No.	Date	Description
	Nil	

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 191.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयरपोर्ट ऑथोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ श्रम न्यायालय सं. 2, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या -सीजीआईटी-2/26/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11011/55/2004-आईआर (एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 191.—In Pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/26/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Airport Authority of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-09.

[No. L-11011/55/2004-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, MUMBAI

Present : A. A. Lad, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-2/26 of 2007

Employers in relation to the Management of Airport
Authority of India

The Airport Director,
Airport Authority of India (IAD),
Mumbai Airport,
Mumbai-400 099.

AND

Their workmen
The President,
Airport Kamgar Union,
CPWD Office Compound,
Bamanwada,
Mumbai-400 059.

APPEARANCES:

For the employer : Ms. Savita Shetye, Representative.

For the workmen : No appearance

Mumbai, dated 5th October, 2009

AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by its Order No. L-11011/55/2004-IR (M) dated 09-02-2007 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial

Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the industrial dispute raised by the Airports Kamgar Union against the management of Airport Authority of India for permanent absorption of Shri Rushikesh C. Kolambekar and 13 other workmen (List attached) justified ? If so, what relief the workmen are entitled to ?”

List of workers as per annexure :

1. Shri Rushikesh C. Kolambekar
2. Shri Amol R. Tambe
3. Shri Z. Z. Ahmed
4. Shri Madan K. Vengurlekar
5. Shri Manoj V. Tanpure
6. Shri P. P. Yemlekar
7. Shri P. Velmurugan
8. Shri R. S. Owale
9. Shri S. V. Shendge
10. Shri S. H. Solse
11. Shri D. R. Khawale
12. Shri Vinod H. Jadhav
13. Shri S. V. Mane
14. Shri S. G. Gawade.

2. After receipt of the reference, notices were sent to union which was served to union vide Ex-4 and again vide Ex-10. No body appeared on behalf of the union to file claim statement. Number of opportunity was given to union. Hence the order.

ORDER

Reference is disposed of for want of prosecution.

Date : 05-10-2009

A. A. LAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 192.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. प्रो. रासो सेख के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ श्रम न्यायालय सं. 1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 224/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/26/2000-आईआर(एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 192.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 224/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation

to the management of M/s. Prop. Rasho Sheikh and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-09.

[No. L-29012/26/2000-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under section 10 (1) (d) (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 224/2000

Parties :- Employers in relation to the Management of M/s. Rasho Sheikh.

And

Their workman

Present : Shri Hari Mangal Singh, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

For the Management : None

For the Union : None

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated the 20th November, 2009

AWARD

By Order No. L.-29012/26/2000-IR (M) dated 23-06-2000, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Prop. Rasho Sheikh in terminating the services of their workman Sh. Maghu Sheikh w.e.f. 31-12-98 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. The reference was received in this Tribunal on 11-8-2000. Thereafter notices were sent to the parties for filing written statement by the concerned workman. But in spite of notice sent to the sponsoring union by speed post neither the concerned workman nor the sponsoring union appeared before this Tribunal nor has filed written statement. It, therefore, appears that neither the concerned workman nor the sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

In such circumstances I render “No Dispute” Award in the present reference case.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 193.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. खान ब्रोदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच,

अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ श्रम न्यायालय सं. 1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 226/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/25/2000-आईआर(एम)]

कमल बाखरू, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 193.—In Pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.226/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Khan Brothers and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-12-09.

[No. L-29012/25/2000-IR (M)]

KAMAL BAKHRU, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under section 10 (1) (d) (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 226/2000

Parties :- Employers in relation to the Management of M/s. Khan Brothers

And

Their workmen

Present : Shri H. M. Singh, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers :

For the Workmen :

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated 9th November, 2009

AWARD

By order No. L. 29012/25/2000-IR (M) dated 23-06-2000, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Khan Brothers in terminating the services of their workmen Sh. Khestu Sheikh, Munfir Sheikh and Fajlehak Sheikh w.e.f. 31-12-98 is justified? If not, to what relief they are entitled to?”

2. This reference case was received in this tribunal on 11-8-2000. Thereafter notices were sent to the parties to

file written statement by the sponsoring union/workmen. In spite of notices sent by speed post no written statement has been filed by the workmen till 20-7-09. It, therefore appears that neither the concerned workmen nor the sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

In such circumstances I render "No Dispute" Award in this reference case.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 194.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कामर्स के प्रबंधन के संबंध निर्योजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ श्रम न्यायालय सं. 1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 4/2009) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/97/2008-आईआर(बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 194.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.4/2009) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No.1, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Oriental Bank of Commerce and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-09.

[No. L-12012/97/2008-IR (B-II)]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1,
CHANDIGARH**

CASE NO. I.D. 4 OF 2009

Sh. Anil Kumar S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, R/o Sl. No. 1 Janta Nagar, Near Kabir Das Mandir, Bathinda (Punjab).

....Applicant

Versus

The A.C. M. Oriental Bank of Commerce, Regional Office, First Floor, Civil Lines Branch, Bathinda.

....Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the Workman : None

For the Management : None

AWARD

Passed on 8-12-2009

Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide notification No. L. 12012/97/2008-IR (B-II) dated

24th of March 2009, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :-

"Whether the action of the Assistant General Manager, Oriental Bank of Commerce Regional Office, Bathinda in terminating the employment w.e.f. 19-03-2008 of Shri Anil Kumar S/o Shri Ashok Kumar employed as a sweeper in civil line branch Bathinda is legal and justified? What relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The workman has moved an application along with affidavit to the effect that he does not want to pursue with the present reference and withdraw the same as he has no grievance against the management of the bank. In view of the application of the workman along with affidavit, the present reference is returned to the Govt. as withdrawn. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh

8-12-09

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 195.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध निर्योजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ श्रम न्यायालय चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 35/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-09 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/19/2007-आईआर(बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 195.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.35/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-09.

[No. L-12012/19/2007-IR (B-II)]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
CHENNAI**

Thursday, the 17th December, 2009

Present : A. N. Janardanan, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 35/2007

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Indian Bank and their Workman)

BETWEEN

Sri K. R. Ramanathan : Petitioner/ I Party
 The Asstt. General Manager (HRM): Respondent/ II Party
 Indian Bank Rajaji Salai,
 Chennai-600001

APPEARANCE

For the 1st Party/ Petitioner : M/s K. M. Ramesh
 For the 2nd Party/ Management : M/s T. S. Gopalan &
 Co.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/19/2007-IR (B-II) dated 06-07-2007 referred the following Industrial Disputes to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

“Whether the action of the management of Indian Bank, Chennai in terminating the services of Sri K. R. Ramanathan vide order dated 24-07-2004 is justified? If not, what relief the dismissed workman is entitled to?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 35/2007 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their advocates and filed their Claim and Counter Statements as the case may be.

3. The case of the petitioner in the Claim Statement briefly reads as follows:

The petitioner who joined service under the Respondent/Bank as Sub-Staff on 23-03-1976 at Triplicane branch while was Clerk/Shroff on promotion at Kodambakkam branch was alleged of commission of shortage of cash of Rs. 10,000 on 05-01-2002, that he had paid Rs. 7,000 of the same to the debit of his SB Account on that day that he had entered a payment of Rs. 10,000 made to SB Customer Mrs. Rajalakshmi that day in his machine which later was found to be against the actual payment in cash made by Mr. A. R. Arunachalam at the request of Mrs. Vijayalakshmi, another Staff. In reply to the memo dated 20-02-2002, he stated that on 05-01-2002, a Saturday there was heavy rush in his counter having had to attend to 160 payments receiving a sum of Rs. 7,00,000, inward remittance of Rs. 17,00,000 from T. Nagar Currency Chest and that in making the payment of Rs. 10,000 he complied with the formalities and that there is no shortage. He further stated that on that day Arunachalam requested for hand loan of Rs. 7,000 to make good shortage of Rs. 10,000 tendering a withdrawal slip on his SB Account. He submitted explanation to a show-cause notice and he submitted a detailed explanation and denied the allegation. But he was charge sheeted on 20-9-2002 accusing falsification of records and enriched to have himself at the cost of another staff amounting to gross misconduct. There was an enquiry held from 03-01-2003 to 17-03-2003 examining MW1 to MW3 on the culmination of which as

per report dated 30-01-2004 with a copy to the petitioner he was asked to explain. He submitted report denying proof of charges. Thereafter show-cause notice dated 24-07-2004 proposing dismissal from service without notice was issued to which he submitted his reply dated 25-08-2004 pleading that he is made a scapegoat. After a personal hearing, the disciplinary Authority on 11-10-2004 imposed the punishment of dismissal without notice. The appeal filed was rejected without bestowing a proper perspective by a cryptic one line order dated 31-03-2006. It is unjust and in victimization and unfair labour practice. The charge proceeds on assumption and presumption. The finding is also not based on any evidence but is based on surmises, suspicion and conjectures. The finding is perverse, biased, prejudiced and one-sided. The order of Disciplinary Authority suffers from the vice of non-application of mind. Same is the case with Appellate Authority. Under section-11A of the ID Act, the evidence is to be re-appreciated for an independent decision by this Tribunal. The factum of encashment of his share of the Provident Fund amount from his SB Account cannot be put against him. Hence the reference.

4. In the Counter Statement, the contentions raised briefly read as follows:

The petitioner had an SB Account and another SB Account No. 35085 in the joint name of his wife Smt. Amudha and himself. On 26-04-2000 for a credit of Rs. 4,000 to the joint account while clearing and posting the balance was wrongly added as Rs. 40,000 to the then existing balance of Rs. 1,13,446.80 with an excess credit of Rs. 36,000. In spite of that awareness the amount was withdrawn. On 17-05-2000 when the petitioner was questioned about it, he remitted the excess amount on 20-05-2000 and 22-5-2000 with interest. On 19-06-2000 an order of caution was issued to him. On 14-09-2000 while he was in SB-3 counter and on 03-10-2000 when he was working in SB-4 counter, the petitioner was found to have had allowed withdrawal of Rs. 5,000 from SB Account No. 30804 of Smt. Kamala G. Menon and Rs. 15,000 from SB Account No. 30804 even though Counter Clerk of SB-3 was very much available. The two withdrawals were found fraudulent for which the petitioner had issued token debiting the accounts to the SB Account and entering the token numbers when not accompanied by Pass Book, petitioner made good the loss. He was then charge sheeted on 14-08-2004 with misconduct. On 05-01-2002 Rajalakshmi a joint account holder of SB Account No. 29694 with one N. Rajasekaran presented a self cheque with No. 00870191 for Rs. 10,000 drawn by Rajasekaran affixing his signature on the reverse of the cheque. The cheque was tendered at the Counter and Token No. 247 was issued. The account was debited at 10.46 AM and cheque was passed at 10.47 AM. Due to heavy rush on that Saturday Rajalakshmi arranged to collect and collected the amount through a Staff, Vijayalakshmi from the Counter of A.R. Arunachalam tendering the Token No. 247. Arunachalam released the token with other tokens without asking for the cheque for which payment was made. In the meantime, the said very cheque had come to the

counter of the petitioner who entered in the system at 12.53 PM showing that payment made. There was found a shortage of Rs. 10,000 in the Cash Counter of Arunachalam. Not being able to locate the mistake, Arunachalam made good the amount with a sum of Rs. 3,000 from his SB Account and borrowing Rs. 7,000 from the petitioner. On 07-01-2002, Vijayalakshmi brought to notice of Arunachalam payment of Rs. 10,000 against Token No. 247 but he took to himself as his mistake due to payment without the instrument. While so, an anonymous letter dated 12-01-2002 was received by the Chairman of the Bank professed to be by the staff of the bank reporting the indulgence of the petitioner in various malpractices but with no action taken against him due to his clout with the Union or his money power. It was probed. Show-cause notice was issued to the petitioner which was not replied to. On 29-02-2002 the petitioner was charge sheeted. An enquiry was held. Only one document was marked on the petitioner's side. The petitioner was found guilty in the enquiry report. On 05-02-2004, he was given a copy of the report to which he replied on 09-03-2004. On 24-07-2004 notice proposing punishment of dismissal was issued to which he replied on 25-08-2004. He was personally heard on 22-09-2004. Thereafter on 11-10-2004 he was dismissed. As against the time of payment noted as 12.53 PM the case of the petitioner is that payment was made immediately but due to pressure of work entry was made only at 12.53 PM. Circumstances show probability that it was Arunachalam who paid Rs. 10,000 against Token No. 247 and that the petitioner could not have made the payment. The findings are based on sound reasoning and the same is not liable to be interfered with. There is credible circumstantial evidence pointing to the misconduct of the petitioner. It is prayed that the dismissal may be upheld.

5. On the side of the petitioner WW1 was examined and ExW1 to Ex. W8 were marked and on the side of the Respondent Ex. M1 to Ex. M47 marked, all on consent. No oral evidence was adduced on the side of the Respondent.

6. Points for consideration are :

- (i) Whether the dismissal of the petitioner by the Respondent/Bank is justified ?
- (ii) To what relief the petitioner is entitled to ?

Point No. 1 & 2

7. Heard both sides and perused the records. In the reference the findings in the domestic enquiry is challenged. The petitioner was examined as WW1. His testimony is that he is not guilty and is innocent. The arguments on behalf of the petitioner are that Ex. M38 letter of Rajalakshmi, Ex. M39 letter of P. Vijayalakshmi and Ex. M40 cheque do not show any culpable involvement of the petitioner. Rajalakshmi has not been examined. Letter is dated 14-02-2002 which is after the anonymous letter. Ex. M38 is bereft of details. Same is the case of Ex. M39 letter of Vijayalakshmi which also suffers the same infirmity. No reliance can be placed on them. Ex. M40 cheque in question shows payment to have been made at 12.53 PM tending to exonerate the petitioner. The finding is assailed as erroneous and perverse as being based on surmises and

assumptions and presumptions. The learned counsel relied on the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in *D. Wilson Vs. The Director of Government Examinations, Nungambakkam* (WLR-1987-69), the decision of the Supreme Court in *G.M. Tank Vs. State of Gujarat and Others* (2006-5-SCC-446) and a catena of other decisions. Going by the decisions it is seen that the dictum of the decisions has no application to the facts of the present case. They are not, therefore, relevant to the decisions in this case.

8. The learned counsel for the Respondent pointed out that the circumstantial evidence available is enough to conclusively hold that the petitioner is guilty of the misconduct. The circumstances speaking well against the petitioner have been narrated. In the report of the Enquiry Officer there is discernibly a correct conclusion arrived at on a logical transition of thought fully commensurate with the circumstances appearing against the petitioner pinpointing the fact that the petitioner has committed the misconduct of appropriating the sum of Rs. 10,000 and he got himself enriched at the cost of A.R. Arunachalam, the other Cashier who at the intervention of Vijayalakshmi, another staff was paying the cheque amount to R. Rajalakshmi without actually insisting for the production of the instrument before him but the token of which he had come into his possession already. This is not to be found as an unusual practice obtaining in banks when known or intimate customers might be preferentially treated by a certain member/members of staff and the casualty as the one supervened in the transaction done by Arunachalam of making the payment without the instrument itself when he is obliging to the request of his another colleague, Vijayalakshmi on whom he may repose confidence. It was while so that in the meantime the instrument reached the hand of the petitioner who claims to have effected the payment of Rs. 10,000 thereunder at 12.53 PM on the same day. At this juncture it is worthwhile to take note of the following uncontroverted facts for consideration : The Kodambakkam branch of the Respondent/Bank was computerized in 2000. Every staff member was given a node and ID number with which the concerned staff can make entries in the system in transactions handled by him. When an account holder wants to draw cash from his account, he has to use a withdrawal slip or a self-cheque invariably affixing the signature on the reverse of the cheque as an advanced acknowledgement for the receipt of the amount. On presentation of the cheque to the counter staff, token is to be issued by him who will debit the personal account and thereafter forward to an Officer who after verifying the signatures of the drawer passes the instrument for payment. The debiting staff will make an entry in the system of his initial. When the instrument is passed the ID of the Passing Officer and time of passing would be entered into the system. The token will be issued to the Account Holder with Token Number on the face of the cheque. The instrument then goes to the Cashier. The Cashier when calls the Token Number, token holder will tender the same to him and collect the cash. At that time, on the back of the instrument if the signature of the account holder has not

been affixed already, the Cashier must then obtain the same before payment. The Cashier will note down the denomination of payment. During occasions of pressure of work or in the case of a known customer Cashier may pay the cash in precedence of other payments against the surrender of his Token and in such a case he will retain the Token till he gets the instrument which is passed for payment. This procedure is not seen scrupulously followed both by the petitioner as well as Arunachalam. According to the petitioner when he noted the time of payment as 12.53 PM his case is that in spite of that he had made the payment immediately after the cheque was passed for payment. According to Vijayalakshmi, the payment was made only by Arunachalam and not by the petitioner.

9. When, to Arunachalam it is a bona fide mistake on his part of having effected payment of the amount of Rs. 10,000 without the instrument itself being before him and on finding a shortage of Rs. 10,000 in his Counter he himself pocketing the guilt made good the loss by a sum of Rs. 3,000 from his own SB Account and borrowing Rs. 7,000 from the petitioner. It is pertinent to note that A.R. Arunachalam has no grievance against the petitioner at all. The anonymous letter raised this controversy upon which a probe was launched and the petitioner was proceeded against and in the enquiry he has been proved to be guilty of having enriched himself with a sum of Rs. 10,000 at the cost of his counterpart A.R. Arunachalam by means of circumstantial evidence though direct evidence is not there to that point. The circumstances could be found to be cogent and conclusive enough to prove that the petitioner is guilty of the misconduct.

10. The learned counsel for the Respondent relied on the decision of - the Supreme Court in Cholan Roadways Ltd. Vs. G Thirugenasambandam (2005-1-LLJ-569) wherein the Apex court has held "In this case, further more, the misdirection in law committed by the Industrial Tribunal was apparent insofar as it did not apply the principle of res ipsa loquitur which was relevant for the purpose of this case and, thus, failed to take into consideration a relevant factor and further more took into consideration and irrelevant fact not germane for determining the issue, namely, the passengers of the bus were mandatorily required to be examined. The Industrial Tribunal further failed to apply the correct standard of proof in relation to a domestic enquiry, which is 'preponderance of probability' and applied the standard of proof required for a criminal trial. A case for judicial review was, thus, clearly made out". The non-examination of R. Rajalakshmi, the customer is not at all material to affect the enquiry in this case.

11. In an industrial adjudication what is required is only evidence of the nature of preponderance of probability. The circumstances obtaining in this case centering around the transaction furnish application of the principle of res ipsa loquitur and speak for themselves as to what actually transpired. They are sufficient and crucial materials logically probative to a prudent mind to hold that the petitioner is guilty of the misconduct charged against him.

Therefore, there need not any hesitation to confirm the finding of guilt against him. In Sri J. D. Jain and the management of State Bank of India and Another (1982-1-LLJ-54), the Apex Court held as follows "the law is well settled that the strict rules of evidence are not applicable in a domestic enquiry".

12. In the light of my foregoing discussion, I hold that the finding of guilt against the petitioner is legal and justified. But regarding his punishment of dismissal, I am constrained to differ in a little way. Though, as to what shall be the punishment on a proved misconduct is in the discretion and prerogative of the Disciplinary authority under Section- 11A of the ID Act power is vested with this forum to interfere with the same in appropriate cases in the background of the concept of justice, equity and good conscience. While this Tribunal is reminded to itself that misplaced leniency or sympathy has no role to play in the matter of awarding punishment to the delinquents for proved misconduct still it should provoke to itself thoughts as to how in a given or particular circumstances the realm of punishment should be dealt with in a most balanced and efficacious manner viewed from the angle of the delinquent and the employer. While a capital punishment of dismissal from service entails in the career death of the punished, it is normally an economic death as well to most of them. Apart from this, there is also the loss of one's reputation when one quits the service by way of dismissal is with a "Stigma of being sent out". In the eye of the public at large he may be looked down upon. He may cease to enjoy the ease and comfort he had hitherto been enjoying. With such a dismissal one is thus punished in several ways. So viewed should the punishment be proportionate to the gravity of the misconduct, the Management ought to have been led by some benign considerations to impose a bit lesser punishment than the one imposed. While taking judicial notice of the fact that in various cases of similar nature with similar gravity of misconduct committed instead of awarding the capital punishment of dismissal many a disciplinary authorities have been found pleased to opt to award a lesser punishment of discharge, removal or compulsory retirement from service of the delinquent instead of the capital punishment. In the case on hand there is a departure from that soft touch in the matter of punishment imposed on the petitioner. This shows lack of consistency regarding the aspect of punishment. It appears that the quantum of punishment depends upon the subjective impression of the authority imposing the punishment at the spur of the time of passing the actual order. Though this process of punishment is on the basis of a discretion, the said discretion is seldom exercised in a judicious manner. Very often the aggravating and the mitigating circumstances are not totally balanced when a punishment is conclusively decided. Most often the authorities are over influenced by misconduct of the delinquent and are urged by emotion to visit them with more than proportionate punishment viewed from the point of the gravity of the misconduct. To fact that there are authorities who impose lesser punishments in similar cases

of misconduct with the same degree of gravity of the misconduct shows lack of uniformity in the area. Therefore, I am fortified in holding that the punishment imposed is to be suitably modified and reduced and such a view is not out of place in this context. Hence it is deemed just and proper that in the broader interests of justice equity and good conscience that the petitioner may be given a lesser punishment of compulsory retirement in lieu of dismissal from service and there by let him enjoy the terminal benefits so as not to deprive him his right to decent living though he happened to commit a grave misconduct. Therefore, it is held that the dismissal of the petitioner from service is not justified.

13. The Respondent is therefore directed to replace the order of dismissal into an order of compulsory retirement.

14. It is further ordered that the petitioner shall make good the liability of Rs. 10,000 by which he stood wrongfully enriched by the impugned misappropriation on 05-01-2002 with interest thereon at 12% per annum from the said date till date of payment before the terminal benefits are disbursed to him in the event of the same becomes payable and are due as per the modification of the punishment herein made. The amount so recovered together with interest shall thereafter be reimbursed to A.R. Arunachalam, the loser of the amount made good by himself owing to the shortage of the amount which necessitated the credit of the sum of Rs. 10,000 at his Counter on 05-01-2002.

9. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A. transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 17th December, 2009)

A. N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : WWI Sri K. R. Ramanathan

For the 2nd Party/Management : None

Documents Marked

On the Petitioner's side

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.W1	11-09-2003	Defence Summing Up Statement filed by the Petitioner Before the Enquiry Officer
Ex.W2	03-09-2004	Findings of the Enquiry Officer
Ex.W3	11-10-2004	Order issued by the Respondent/Bank imposing upon the Petitioner the punishment of Dismissal without notice
Ex.W4	12-11-2004	Petitioner's appeal to the Executive Director of the Respondent/Bank
Ex.W5	31-03-2006	Order of the Respondent/Bank rejecting the appeal of the Petitioner

Ex.W6	12-04-2006	Petition filed by the Petitioner under Section-2A of the ID Act, 1947 before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Chennai
Ex.W7	4-09-2006	Reply filed by the Respondent Bank before Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Chennai
Ex.W8	11-10-2006	Rejoinder filed by the Petitioner before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Chennai

On the Petitioner's side

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.M1	29-05-2000	Investigation Report of Mr. S. Ramachandran regarding wrong balance of Rs. 36,000 in SB A/c of Petitioner and his wife.
Ex.M2	19-06-2000	Order of "Caution" issued to petitioner
Ex.M3	03-02-2001	Investigation Report of Mr. S. Ramamurthy on the complaint of Mrs. Kamala G. Menon-Fraudulent withdrawals totaling to Rs. 20,000
Ex.M4	24-01-2003	Show Cause Notice issued to Petitioner
Ex.M5	6-02-2003	Petitioner's reply to show cause notice dated 24-01-2003
Ex.M6	14-08-2004	Charge Sheet issued to petitioner on the complaint of Mrs. Kamala G. Menon-Fraudulent withdrawals of Rs. 20,000
Ex.M7	12-01-2002	Anonymous complaint letter addressed to Chairman of the respondent/Bank
Ex.M8	22-01-2002	Letter from Circle office of the bank to Branch Manager of Kodambakkam Branch of the bank enclosing anonymous complaint letter
Ex.M9	25-01-2002	Report from the Branch Manager, Kodambakkam to the Circle Office of the bank, Chennai-8
Ex.M10	22-06-2002	Show Cause Notice issued to the Petitioner
Ex.M11	20-09-2002	Charge Sheet and Notice of Enquiry issued to Petitioner

Ex.M12	28-09-2002	Reply of Petitioner to show cause notice dated 22-06-2002 enclosing copy of his reply dated 01-07-2002	Ex.M27	25-08-2004	petitioner's reply to the second show cause Notice
Ex.M13	12-10-2002	Letter of petitioner to Enquiry Officer to defer the Enquiry	Ex.M28	11-09-2004	Notice of personal hearing - Fixing personal hearing on 22-09-2004
Ex.M14	31-10-2002	Letter from Respondent to Petitioner directing him to attend the enquiry	Ex.M29	22-09-2004	Proceedings of personal hearing
Ex.M15	4-10-2002	Proceedings of enquiry	Ex.M30	11-10-2004	Punishment Order - Dismissal from service issued to the petitioner by the Bank
	16-10-2002	-do-	Ex.M31	12-11-2004	Appeal to the petitioner
	3-01-2003	-do-	Ex.M32	05-01-2006	Proceedings of the personal hearing of the Appellate Authority
	27-01-2003	-do-	Ex.M33	31-03-2006	Orders of the Appellate Authority
	17-02-2003	-do-	Ex.M34	21-06-1990	SB Account Opening Form and Specimen signature Card of M/s. M. Rajasekaran and Rajalakshmi E(or) SB A/c No.29694
	10-03-2003	-do-			
	17-03-2003	-do-			
Ex.M16	8-08-2003	Presenting Officer's submission	Ex.M35	10-07-2002	Letter from petitioner to DGM/ Disciplinary Authority of the Bank
Ex.M17	11-09-2003	Defence representative's submission	Ex.M36	28-09-2002	-do-
Ex.M18	30-01-2004	Inquiry Officer's findings	Ex.M37	25-01-2002	Letter from Branch Manager, Kodambakkam to AGM (South)
Ex.M19	5-02-2004	Letter of respondent sending Enquiry Officer's Report and calling for the comments of the petitioner on the findings of Enquiry Officer	Ex.M38	14-02-2002	Letter given by Mrs. R. Rajalakshmi regarding SB A/c No.29694
Ex.M20	9-03-2004	Petitioner's post dated reply received on 20-03-2004	Ex.M39	13-02-2002	Letter given by P. Vijayalakshmi
Ex.M21	10-03-2004	Letter from Respondent to Petitioner directing him to submit his comments before 17-03-2004	Ex.M40	05-01-2002	Cheque No. 870191 dated 05-10-2002 and the reverse of it
Ex.M22	24-07-2004	Second Show Cause Notice issued to the Petitioner	Ex.M41	14-02-2002	Letter from Branch Manager, Kodambakkam to AGM-CO, Vigilance Deptt, Chennai-8
Ex.M23	02-08-2004	Letter from petitioner to GM/ Disciplinary Authority to adjourn the personal hearing fixed 04-08-2004	Ex.M42	20-02-2002	Letter from AR Arunachalam to AGM - Vigilance Deptt., C.O., Chennai -8
Ex.M24	14-08-2004	Letter from GM/Disciplinary Authority to petitioner granting time upto 17-08-2004 to submit his reply	Ex.M43	22-02-2002	Letter from Branch Manager, Kodambakkam to AGM (South),- CO, , Chennai-8
Ex.M25	14-08-2004	Letter from petitioner to GM/ Disciplinary Authority requesting to fix personal hearing at the end of August 2004	Ex.M44	20-02-2002	Letter from petitioner of AGM-Vigilance Deptt, CO., Chennai-(S)
Ex.M26	25-08-2004	Petitioner's letter to GM/ Disciplinary Authority to adjourn the personal hearing on 28-08-2004	Ex.M45	26-02-2002	Letter from Branch Manager, Kodambakkam to AGM-C.O, South
			Ex.M46	18-03-2002	Letter from Branch Manager, to AGM-C.O, Chennai-8
			Ex.M47	05-01-2002	Indian Bank, Kodambakkam Branch - combined Transaction Log for 05-01-2002

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 196.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-I, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 135/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/182/96-आई आर (बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 196.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 135/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/ Labour Court . I, Chandigarh now as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L.12012/182/96-IR(B-II)]

U.S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 135/97

Shri Vinod Kholi, C/o H.S. Arora, H.No. 2299, Sector.4.C,
Chandigarh

Applicant

Versus

The Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank, Regional
Office, Kapurthala, Punjab

Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: Shri Sandeep Bhardwaj.

For the management: Shri N.K. Zakhmi

AWARD

Passed on 03-12-09

The Central Government vide notification No. L.12012/182/96-IR (B.II), dated 23-06-97, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank, Kapurthala in terminating the services of Shri Vinod Kohli is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled and from what date?”

2. Case repeatedly called. Workman is not present for his evidence despite knowledge. He is not appearing for his evidence for the last many dates. Counsel for the workman also pleads no instructions. In view of the above as the workman appears to be not interested to pursue the present reference. In view of the above, the present reference is returned as such to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh

03-12-09

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 197.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब एवं सिंधु बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-I, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 89 ऑफ 99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/119/98-आई आर (बी-II)]

यू. एस. पाण्डेय, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 197.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 89 of 99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-I, Chandigarh now as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab & Sind Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-12012/119/98-IR (B-II)]

U. S. PANDEY, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 89 of 99

Sh. Rakesh Kumar Aggarwal C/o Sh. Tek Chand Sharma,
25 Sant Nagar, Civil Lines, Ludhiana.

...Applicant

Versus

Punjab & Sind Bank, The Chief Manager, Pb. & Sind Bank,
Zonal Office Civil Lines, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: None

For the management: None

AWARD

Passed on 14-12-2009

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide Notification No. L.12012/119/98-IR(B.II) dated 4-3-1999 referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

“Whether the action of the management of the bank Zonal Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank, Zonal Office Civil Lines, Ludhiana in voluntarily retiring Sh. Rakesh Kumar Aggarwal w.e.f. 10-6-95 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from what date?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman despite notice. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh :

dated 14-12-2009

G.K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 198.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सी.पी.डब्ल्यू.डी. के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण न. 1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1/2009) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/79/2008-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 198.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 1/2009) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court I, Chandigarh shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of C.P.W.D. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-12012/79/2008-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 1/2009

Shri Balwinder Kumar S/o Shri Manphool Chand, H.No. 46, St. No.3 Balmiki Basti, Near Telephone Exchange, Bedi Barradari, Patiala (Punjab)

... Applicant

Versus

The Executive Engineer, C.P.W.D. Central Division.I.
Kendriya Sadan, Sector.9.A. Chandigarh-160001

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: None

For the management: Shri Anish Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 7-12-2009

The Central Govt. vide Notification No. L.42012/79/2008-IR(DU), dated 20-3-2009, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the contract between the management of CPWD and their contractor with regard to employment of Shri Balwinder Kumar is sham and bogus? If yes, whether the action of the management in terminating his services w.e.f. 5-2-2007 is legal and justified and to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared for the workman. Management filed written statement along with affidavit. Workman is not present for his evidence. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue with the present reference. In view of the above, the present reference is returned as such to the Central Govt. for want of presecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh

7-12-09

G.K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 199.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण न. 1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1034/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/139/95-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 199.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 1034/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court I, Chandigarh as shown in the annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/139/95-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 1034/2005 (7496)

Shri Ramesh Kumar S/o Shri Mir Singh Village Wazirabad,
Near Chatriwala, Teh. & District Gurgaon

... Applicant

Versus

DGM, Telecom, Main E-10-B, Exchange, Delhi Road
Gurgaon

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the workman: Sh. Hoshiar Singh, Advocate

For the management: Deepali Puri, Advocate

AWARD

Passed on 16-12-2009

This reference, which was referred by the Central Government in the year 1996 is placed before me for award today. Central Government in its reference desired to answer this reference within three months from the date of receiving the same. I am answering it after 14 years. It is an abnormal delay and certainly a case of denial timely justice. Reasons may be many. The Tribunal might have lying vacant for a considerable period and so many other constraints, but the ultimate sufferer has been the workman, who is a member of socio-economic backward class of Indian democracy. I cannot do anything at this stage except to honour my inner conscience by apologizing the workman on behalf of this Tribunal for denying timely justice.

Government of India vide Notification No. L-40012/139/95-IR (DU) dated 26-7-1996 by exercising its powers under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication of this Tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Telecom Department, Gurgaon in terminating the services of

Shri Ramesh Kumar is proper, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

After receiving the reference parties were informed. Parties appeared and filed their respective pleadings. The case of workman in nutshell is that he was appointed by the management of Telecommunication Department as a Peon on 23-9-1993 on daily wage basis. He served the department continuously up to 18-9-1994. He had worked more than 240 days in the preceding year from the date of his termination. His services were illegally terminated on 10-10-1994. From 18-9-1994 to 30-9-1994 his wages were released in the name of Naresh Kumar, whereas, from 1-10-1994 to 10-10-1994 his salary were released in the name of Ramesh Kumar. His services were terminated without retrenchment notice or one month wages in lieu of notice and lawful terminal dues. This renders his termination illegal and void being against the provisions of the Act. It was also the contention of the workman that he was also denied the benefit of the scheme of the department of telecommunication 1989 regarding grant of temporary status and regularization of services of casual and daily wage workers. On the basis of above facts, the workman has requested for setting aside his termination order and consequential order for reinstatement of his services along with all the benefits.

The management of respondent appeared and denied the contention of the workman. Master servant relationship was denied by the management. It was specifically stated that the workman was never appointed by the management in any capacity.

Both of the parties were afforded the opportunity of adducing evidence. Statement of workman was recorded, whereas, on behalf of the management, one Govind Singh, Accounts Officer, filed his affidavit and was cross-examined by learned counsel for the workman. Certain documents were summoned by the workman from the custody of the management. But the management denied the custody of the documents. Workman also filed the photo copies of certain documents, which are marked Ex. 3 onwards. These are 28 page documents, which the workman has filed. Parties were heard at length. Main issue before this Tribunal is whether there existed any employer-employee relationship between the management and the workman? The management has totally denied any such relationship. It is stated by the management that workman Ramesh was never engaged by the management in any capacity. When cross-examined, the witness of the management Shri Govind Singh did not doubt the genuineness of the documents filed by the workman. He could only manage to deny the name of the Officer, who signed the documents. He once again specifically stated that original documents, photocopies of which have been filed by the workman, are not in the possession of the management. If the documents filed by the workman are perused properly, it is evidently clear that workman has worked with the management for the period mentioned in statement of claim. The document marked W.3 is a document regarding engagement of the

workman with effect from 23-9-1993. The endorsement of telecommunication department is very well clear on the appointment of workman and the circumstances under which the workman was appointed on daily wage basis are also mentioned. Documents at page No. 45 of the file make it clear that three persons including the workman were working with the management of telecommunication. The rates of daily wage and the period of work is also mentioned in the document. In rest of the documents filed by the workman, it is clearly established that workman was working under telecommunication department. The letter at page No. 47 of the file reveals that three part-time Mazdoors were working with Telecommunication Department, Gurgaon. Name of the workman figure in the letter and it is also mentioned about the change of labour to avoid the day's problem for the telecommunication department.

The contents of this letter, which is written by SDOP, Gurgaon to the AO (TR), C/o GMTFEBD, Gurgaon dated 30-9-1994 makes it clear that work was available with the management of telecommunication department. It was due to avoid the day's problem for the telecommunication department, the labour was changed. This letter is enough to show the unlawful labour practice adopted by the department. If the work was available and the workman is ready to work, he could not be replaced. This letter itself shows that the services of the workman were terminated (by replacing the labour) just to frustrate the provisions of the Act, regarding the lawful protection conferred upon the workman. The provisions of law creates the embargo of protection that the services of the workman cannot be terminated, otherwise than the procedure established in the Act.

It is strange in this case that the management has totally denied any relationship with the workman. The workman has worked for a considerable period with the management. He has filed certain photo copies of documents to prove that he was working with the management. The genuineness of these documents has not been challenged by the management. The management firstly denied that the workman had ever worked with the management and also stated that documents are not lying in its custody, whereas, the correspondence between the officers of the management, filed by the workman shows that to prevent the workman to exercise his lawful claim and right under the provisions of the Act, his services were terminated. Management was supposed to file the original documents, but they denied having the custody. It also shows that management has deliberately failed to file the documents to prevent the workman to enjoy his lawful right. The workman was fortunate enough to have certain photo copies of documents, which he filed before this Tribunal. Documents prove that there existed a master-servant relationship between the workman and the management. He was paid wages by the management. He was appointed by the management vide letter Ex. W.3 and administrative control over the workman was of the management. Attendance sheets have also been filed by the workman and some documents regarding the payment

of wages are also on record. Thus, there is no doubt to hold that workman was appointed by management as daily wage worker and he worked for the period mentioned in the claim.

It is a clear case of withholding of the documents by the management to prevent the workman for exercising and enjoying his lawful right under the provisions of the Act. Under such circumstances, where the management was supposed to file all the documents and he failed, adverse inference shall be taken. The nature of inference for me should be the workman shall be considered and presumed to work for the entire period he claimed in the statement of claim.

Accordingly, on the basis of presumption and proof, I am of the view that the services of the workman were terminated by the management and workman has completed 240 days work in the preceding year from the date of his termination.

It is admitted case that no notice or one month wages in lieu of notice or terminal dues were paid to the workman. The provisions of the Act does not prohibit the termination of the services of any daily wage worker through retrenchment, but it regulates the termination. The termination of the workman is regulated in the way that management has to give a notice of 30 days or pay 30 days wages in lieu of the notice and lawful terminal dues for termination of the services of daily wage worker. Notice and lawful terminal dues are the conditions precedents for termination of the services of the daily waged worker. This condition precedent was violated by the act of management. Terminating the services of the workman without notice and without terminal dues renders the termination of the workman void and illegal.

When the services of any workman are declared to be void, unlawful and illegal, there are two possible remedies available. The first remedy is the reinstatement of the workman into services and another remedy is the reasonable compensation. It is the settled law of service jurisprudence that priority should be given for reinstatement of the services of the workman because the law prefers to protect the right of work of a workman. In exceptional cases, the workman may also be compensated by a reasonable amount of compensation.

The facts and circumstances of the case are peculiar. In spite of having the services of the workman for more than 240 days in the preceding year from the date of termination, the management denied any relationship with the workman. The documents filed by the workman proved that affidavit filed by the witness of management was false. The management not only denied any relationship, but it also denied and failed to file any documents regarding the services of the workman. All the document in the view of this Tribunal are lying in the custody of the management, because from the very document, the workman has obtained the photocopies. The genuineness of the photo copies have not been challenged by the management. There

is one more peculiar circumstance of this case that this Tribunal took 14 years to answer this reference. I cannot term it as the state wrong for denying timely justice by a quasi Judicial Administrative Tribunal. But it was not the fault of the workman that long 14 years time was taken by this Tribunal for answering and adjudicating the reference. Accordingly, I am of the view that reinstatement of the workman into the services is the appropriate remedy in this case. Law, which includes the judicial pronouncements does not disapproves the reinstatement of the services of the workman, rather prefers the protection of right to work. Accordingly, the management of respondent telecommunication department is directed to reinstate the services of the workman within one month from the date of publication of this award. The workman will also be entitled for the back wages, because he suffered for a long time for his no fault.

The workman has also requested for benefit of scheme of management for granting temporary status and regularization of services of daily waged worker. The documents, which has been narrated by me in the body of this award and which are at page 47 of the file proves that to prevent the workman his lawful claim, his services were terminated. It is the unlawful labour practice adopted by the management. Accordingly, the management is also directed to give benefit of the scheme as narrated by the workman, if he is otherwise eligible for temporary status and regularization of the services strictly as per the terms of the circular letter. Accordingly, the reference is answered. Let Central Government be approached for publication of award, and thereafter, the filed be consigned to record room.

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 200.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 268/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/123/2001-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 200.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 268/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.-1, Chandigarh as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/123/2001-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 268 of 2001

Sh. Ajit Singh S/o Sh. Gurdit Singh, Vill. Gharana Masand,
P.O. Chowki, Jamwaja, Hamirpur (Distt.). 177001,

... Applicant.

Vs.

1. The Divisional Engineer, Telecom Project, Hamirpur,
Hamirpur Distt.

2. The Sub-Divisional Engineer, Telecom Project,
Hamirpur, Hamirpur Distt. 177001.

... Respondent.

APPEARANCES

For the workman : None.

For the management : None.

AWARD

Passed on 9-12-2009.

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide notification No. L-40012/23/2001-I.R. (D.U) dated 9th July, 2001, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

“Whether the action of the management of the Divisional Engineer Telecom Projects, Hamirpur and SDE, Telecom Project, Hamirpur in terminating the services of Sh. Ajit Singh S/o Sh. Gurdit Singh w.e.f. 01-09-2000 is just and legal? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh :

Dated 9-12-2009 G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 201.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 330/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/235/2001-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 201.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 330/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.-I, Chandigarh as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/235/2001-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I. D. 330 of 2001

Sh. Davinder Kumar C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet,
27349, Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda.

... Applicant

Vs.

The General Manager,
Telecom, Bhatinda
(Punjab). 151 001.

... Respondent.

APPEARANCES

For the workman : None.
For the management : Sh. G.C. Babbar.

AWARD

Passed on 9-12-2009.

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide notification No. L-40012/235/2001 R. (D.U) dated 6th November, 2001, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in terminating the services of Sh. Davinder Kumar S/o Sh. Chhotu Ram is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh :

Dated 9-12-2009 G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का. आ. 202.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निरिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं.-1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या

246/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/90/2001-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S. O. 202.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 246/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.-I, Chandigarh as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/90/2001-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I. D. 246 of 2001

Sh. Ravi Kumar
C/o Sh. N.K. Jeet.
27349, Lal Singh Basti Road,
Bhatinda.

... Applicant.

Vs.

The General Manager,
Telecom, Bhatinda
(Punjab). 151 001.

... Respondent.

APPEARANCES

For the workman : None
For the management : None

AWARD

Passed on 9-12-2009.

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide notification No. L-40012/90/2001-I.R. (D.U) dated 14th June, 2001, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager, Telecom, Bhatinda in terminating the services of Sh. Ravi Kumar S/o Sh. Moti Ram just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh :

Dated 9-12-2009 G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 203.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत संचार निगम लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1296/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/84/2006-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 203.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1296/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum-Labour Court No.-I, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/84/2006-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRIGYANENDRAKUMARSHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 1296 of 2007.

Sh. Gurdeep Singh S/o Sh. Kartar Singh, V. & P.O.

Sandhir, Karnal.

...Applicant.

Vs.

The General Manager, BSNL, Sector 8, Distt. Karnal.

...Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the Workman : None

For the Management : Sh. G.C. Babbar.

AWARD

Passed on 9-12-2009

Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide notification No. L-40012/84/2006/IR (D.U.), Dated 12th January, 2007, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of BSNL, Karnal, in terminating the services of Sh. Gurdeep Singh w.e.f. 7-10-2005 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case, the present reference is returned to the Central Government for want of prosecution. Central Government be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh.

Dated 9-12-2009

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 204.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत संचार निगम लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-I, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 210/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/228/2003-आई आर (डीयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 204.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 210/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum-Labour Court No.-I, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/228/2003-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRIGYANENDRAKUMARSHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 210 of 2004.

Sh. Sandeep Kumar S/o Sh. Parmod Kumar, V. & P.O.

Sohari-III, Tehsil Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur-174311

...Applicant.

Vs.

The Telecom Distt. Manager, BSNL, Kullu (HP)- 175101.

...Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the Workman : None

For the Management : Sh. Sanjay Goyal.

AWARD

Passed on 9-12-2009.

Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide notification No. L-40012/228/2003/IR (DU), Dated 7th June, 2004, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of Telecom, now known as BSNL, in terminating the services of Sh. Sandeep Kumar Ex-Temporary Labourer w.e.f. 31-12-96 without complying with the provisions of the ID Act, 1947 is just and legal ? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case, the present reference is returned to the Central Government for want of prosecution. Central Government be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh

Dated 9-12-2009 G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2009

का.आ. 205.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत संचार निगम लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-1, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1270/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-12-2009 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/14/2005-आई आर (डोयू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2009

S.O. 205.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1270/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.-1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-12-2009.

[No. L-40012/14/2005-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 1270 of 2006.

Sh. Kuldeep Singh S/o Sh. Karam Singh, Old DSP Road,
Ma Jagdamba Crockery House, Fatehabad

... Applicant.

Vs.

The General Manager, TD. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.
Hissar.

... Respondent

APPEARANCES

For the Workman : None

For the Management : None.

AWARD

Passed on 9-12-2009

Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide notification No. L-40012/14/2005/IR (DU), Dated 14th June, 2006, referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of GMTD, BSNL, Hissar in terminating the services of Sh. Kuldeep Singh S/o Sh. Karam Singh, Driver w.e.f. 18-3-2004 is just and legal ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. Case repeatedly called. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue his case. In view of the above as the workman is not appearing to pursue his case the present reference is returned to the Central Government for want of prosecution. Central Government be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh.

Dated 9-12-2009 G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 206.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 01 फरवरी, 2010 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबंध आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :—

“ आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य के कर्नूल जिले में स्थित धोन् मण्डल के धोन् नगरपालिका तथा उनके आस-पास स्थित 1. यू. कोतपल्ली, 2. उंगरानिगुंडला, 3. धर्मवरम्, 4. येरागुंडला, 5. गोंसानिपल्ली, 6. चिदलपेटा, 7. उडुमुलपाडु, 8. अब्बेरिडिडपल्ली, 9. वेंकटापुरम्, 10. दोरापल्ली, 11. वेंकटानायुनिपल्ली, 12. कोचीरूऊ राजस्व गांव तथा 13. जोगदुर्ति राजस्व गांव के अंतर्गत आने वाले सभी क्षेत्र।”

[संख्या एस-38013/01/2010-एस.एस.1]

एस.डी. जेवियर, अपर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 206.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st February, 2010 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and

Chapter -V and VI (except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Andhra Pradesh namely:—

“All the areas falling within the limits of “ Dhone Municipality and its surrounding Villages of 1. U. Kothapalli, 2. Ungaranigundla, 3. Dharmavaram, 4. Yerragundla, 5. Gosanipalli, 6. Chintlapeta, 7. Udumulapadu, 8. Abbireddypalli, 9. Venkatapuram, 10. Dorapalli, 11. Venkatanayunipalli, 12. Kocheeruvu, and 13. Jogadurthy of Dhone mandal in Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh.”

[No. S-38013/01/2010-S.S. 1]

S.D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 207.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948(1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 01 फरवरी, 2010 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 (धारा -76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबंध पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

“ दार्जिलिंग जिला में पांचकुलगुड़ी, नेमाई, बनियाखड़ी, वनिमाखली गुडिया, धुकूडिया, धोकमा, माथापरि, बारगडिया बैराथिसाल, बड़मानसिंह जोत, बड़ोमोहनसिंह जोत, रुमसिंह, पथनघाटा, गौरचरण, पंचानई, कड़ईबाड़ी, उधमसिंह, उदय सिंह, चुमटा, राजपैरी, जितु, डाबग्राम जे.एल.1, डाकनिकाटा जे.एल.83, मातरम, महिसमारी, कालाबाड़ी, सिलिगुडी जे. एल. 88, खपरेल, मलागुरी, माटिगरा हाट, काबाखड़ी काबाखली फौतसिंह, सलबारी छत मौजा के क्षेत्रों को शामिल कर ”

[सं. एस-38013/02/2010-एसएस 1]

एस.डी.जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 207.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st February, 2010 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter -V and VI (except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of West Bengal namely:—

“Areas comprising the Mouzas of Panchkulguri, Nemai, Baniakhari/Baniakhali, Guria, Dhukuria, Ghokma, Mathapari, Bargharia, Bairathisal, Barmansingh Jote, Baromohan singh Jote Rupsingh, Patharghata, Gourcharan, Panchanai, Karaibari, Udamsingh, Udaysingh, Chumta, Rajpairi, Jitu,

Dabgram, JL No. 1, Daknikata, JL No. 83, Matram, Mahishmari, Kalabari, Siliguri, JL No. 88, Khaprali, Mallaguri, Matigara Hat, Kabakhari, Kabakholi, Fautsingh, Salbari Chhat in the District of Darjeeling.”

[No. S-38013/02/2010-S.S.-1]

S.D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 208.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948(1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 01 फरवरी, 2010 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 (धारा -76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबंध कर्नाटक राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

क्र.सं.	राजस्व ग्राम का नाम	होबलो	तालुक	जिला
	नगरपालिका	सीमाएँ		
1.	कनचनहल्ली (सातेनहल्ली)	शांतिग्रामा	हासन	हासन

[संख्या-एस-38013/03/2010-एस एस 1]

एस.डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 208.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st February, 2010 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter -V and VI (except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Karnataka namely:—

Sl. No.	Name of the Revenue Hobli	Taluk	Distric
	Village of Municipal Limits		

1.	Kanchanahalli (Sathenahally)	Shanthigramma	Hassan Hassan
----	---------------------------------	---------------	---------------

[No. S-38013/03/2010-SS-1]

S.D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 209.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948(1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 01 फरवरी, 2010 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 (धारा -76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के

उपबंध कर्नाटक, राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

क्र.सं.	राजस्व ग्राम का नाम नगरपालिका सीमाएँ	होबली	तालुक	जिला
1.	कुणिगल	कसबा	कुणिगल	तुमकूर
2.	कल्लनायकनहल्ली	हुत्रोदुर्गा	कुणिगल	तुमकूर

[संख्या-एस-38013/04/2010-एस एस 1]

एस.डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 209.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st February, 2010 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter -V and VI (except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Karnataka namely:—

Sl. No.	Name of the Revenue Village of Municipal Limits	Hobli	Taluk	Distirict
1.	Kunigal	Kasaba	Kunigal	Tumkur
2.	Kallanayakanahalli	Hutridurga	Kunigal	Tumkur

[No. S-38013/04/2010-S.S. 1]

S.D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 210.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948(1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 01 फरवरी, 2010 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 (धारा -76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा-77,78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबंध पंजाब राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

क्रमांक.	राजस्व ग्राम का नाम	हदबस्त स. तहसील	जिला
1.	दक बुलाराई 66	फगवाड़ा	कपूरथला
2.	झीता कलां 262	अमृतसर	अमृतसर
3.	काला टिब्बा 111	अबोहर	फिरोजपुर

[संख्या-एस-38013/05/2010-एस एस.-1]

एस.डी. जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 210.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st February, 2010 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter -V and VI (except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Punjab namely:—

Sl. No.	Name of the Village	Had Bast No.	Tehsil	District
1.	Dak Bhullari	66	Phagwara	Kapurthala
2.	Jheeta Kalan	262	Amritsar	Amritsar
3.	Kala Tibba	111	Abohar	Ferozepur

[No. S-38013/05/2010-S.S. 1]

S.D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 2010

का.आ. 211.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948(1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 01 फरवरी, 2010 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 (धारा -76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा-77,78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबंध गुजरात राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

- ग्राम पंचायत/नगरपालिका/राजस्व सीमाएँ—
- गांव कडोदरा, वरंली, पलसाना, तनतीथैया, जालवा, वाकानेडा और चलथान तहसील पलसाना जिला सुरत।
 - गांव वन्ज तहसील चोरयासी जिला सुरत।

[संख्या एस-38013/06/2010-एस.एस.1]

एस.डी.जेवियर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th January, 2010

S.O. 211.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st February, 2010 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter -V and VI (except Sub-Section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Gujarat:—

Gram Panchayat/Municipal/Revenue limits of:—

- Villages Kadodara, Vareli Palsana, Tantithaiya, Jolva, Vankaneda and Chalthan of Taluka Palsana in Distirct Surat &
- Village Vanz of Taluka Choryasi in District Surat.

[No. S-38013/06/2010-S.S.1]

S.D. XAVIER, Under Secy.

